

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Society for Psychical Research
PART LXXXVI.
OCTOBER, 1922.

PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING.

AN EXAMINATION AND ANALYSIS OF CASES OF TELEPATHY BETWEEN LIVING PERSONS PRINTED IN THE "JOURNAL" OF THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE BOOK "PHANTASMS OF THE LIVING," BY GURNEY, MYERS, AND PODMORE, IN 1886.¹

BY MRS. HENRY SIDGWICK.

INTRODUCTION.

THOSE who have read what we may call for short Gurney's book—and all who are interested in psychical research should read it—will realise that under the title "Phantasms of the Living" are included all experiences where there is reason to suppose that the mind of one living person has affected the mind of another otherwise than through the recognised channels of sense. The experiences may be spontaneous, or the result of experiment. They range from apparitions to purely ideational and emotional impressions and motor impulses, and they may occur

¹ The period covered is from June 1886 to the end of 1920, included in Volumes III. to XIX. of the *Journal*. Part of this paper was read at a meeting of the Society on June 1, 1920.

in waking life, or, as dreams, in sleep. The person receiving the impression is called the percipient, and the person from whom it is presumed to come, the agent. It is assumed that an experience occurring to the percipient as much as twelve hours after the death of the agent may be a phantasm of the *living*, as we have to allow both for the possibility of delay in the emergence of the telepathic impression received, and of bodily life not absolutely ceasing at the apparent moment of death. The above definitions and explanations are hardly necessary for the majority of readers, but it is as well to make clear what this paper is to be about.¹

Since Gurney's book was published thirty-six years have elapsed, and many fresh cases have naturally been received by the Society. These have for the most part been printed in the *Journal*, but some of them have, without first appearing in the *Journal*, been published either in various papers in *Proceedings*, or in Podmore's book *Apparitions and Thought-transference*, published in 1894, or in Myers' book *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death*, published posthumously in 1903. Also some fifty-four cases printed in the *Journal* have since been published in *Proceedings* or in one of these books, and being, therefore, already before the public, are excluded from this paper.² Those cases printed, by the Society, in the *Journal* only are not readily accessible to the general public, as the *Journal* is printed for private circulation. Moreover, what is more important, they are only to a very slight extent classified, and cases unclassified and scattered through many volumes are not in a convenient form for study.

¹ There are, of course, cases printed in the *Journal* which cannot by any stretch be regarded as phantasms of the living—cases such as premonitions, apparent communications from the dead, some accounts of haunted houses, and others. But these are outside the present discussion. Taken all together, they are far less numerous than the cases which may be regarded as phantasms of the living.

² The following is a list of these fifty-four cases with their place of publication. "Podmore" stands for his *Apparitions and Thought-Transference*, H.P. stands for Myers' *Human Personality and its Survival*

I have therefore for some time felt, and was glad to hear the same view expressed by Mr. G. E. Wright in a paper read to the Society in 1919, and printed in the *Journal* for June, 1920, that the time has come when these cases should be collected together, analysed and discussed, and at any rate a good many of them published in the *Proceedings*. The present paper is an attempt to do this. But I am making further restrictions. I propose to omit all cases in which the interval between experience and record exceeds five years. This time limit is arbitrary, and, as would be the case with any other limit chosen, does not discriminate infallibly between the evidential value of the cases it includes and excludes. It is probably partly for this reason that no time limit was fixed in the books and articles I have referred to above. But early record of cases is

of Bodily Death. When a case has been published in two places, this is not always stated.

Number of Case.	Place in <i>Journal</i> .	Where Published.	Number of Case.	Place in <i>Journal</i> .	Where Published.
G. $\frac{315}{t}$	III. 252	Podmore.	L. 940	V. 258	Podmore & <i>Proc.</i> XIV.
L. $\frac{322}{t}$	III. 254	"	M. 41	V. 299	<i>Proc.</i> IX.
L. $\frac{324}{t}$	III. 267	" & H.P.	L. 945	V. 318	H.P.
L. $\frac{325}{t}$	III. 268	Podmore.	L. 944	V. 322	Podmore.
	III. 295	"	L. 946	VI. 4	"
	III. 307	"	L. 955	VI. 104	<i>Proc.</i> XIV.
L. 829	IV. 88	<i>Proc.</i> VII.	M. 56	VI. 112	H.P.
M. Cl. 670	IV. 91	<i>Proc.</i> XI.	L. 958	VI. 129	"
G. 184	IV. 140	Podmore.	G. 242	VI. 146	"
L. 1071	IV. 191	"	L. 961	VI. 163	Podmore.
P. Cl. 129	IV. 223	<i>Proc.</i> XI.	L. 969	VI. 185	<i>Proc.</i> XI.
L. 837	IV. 239	Podmore.	G. 245	VI. 230	H.P.
L. 841	IV. 271	<i>Proc.</i> VIII.	L. 976	VI. 284	<i>Proc.</i> XI.
L. 850	IV. 321	<i>Proc.</i> X.	M. Cl. 90	VI. 294	"
L. 860	IV. 344	Podmore.	L. 982	VII. 25	H.P.
L. 863	V. 21	<i>Proc.</i> X.	M. Cl. 92	VII. 103	"
L. 864	V. 35	Podmore.	G. 248	VII. 173	"
L. 874	V. 61	H.P.	G. 249	VII. 175	"
L. 875	V. 63	Podmore.	L. 995	VII. 176	<i>Proc.</i> XIV.
L. 876	V. 68	H.P.	G. 250	VII. 188	H.P.
L. 877	V. 69	<i>Proc.</i> & H.P.		VII. 234	"
L. 884	V. 134	Podmore.	L. 998	VII. 238	<i>Proc.</i> XIV.
L. 892	V. 147	H.P.	L. 1000	VII. 243	<i>Proc.</i> XIV.
L. 938	V. 252	Podmore.	L. 1075	VII. 243	" & H.P.
L. 939	V. 253	H.P.		VII. 323	H.P.
			L. 1095	VIII. 140	H.P.
			L. 1099	VIII. 192	<i>Proc.</i> XIV.
			L. 1100	VIII. 193	"
			M. Cl. 103	XII. 17	<i>Proc.</i> XXI.

now more important than it was. We have arrived at a stage when, if our knowledge of telepathy is to grow, we want not only evidence of the broad fact that there was a coincidence between the phantasm and some external event suggesting a causal connection between them, but light on the process of telepathy and the conditions under which evidence of it can be obtained. For this details become more and more important, and it will, I think, be readily admitted that five years is a long time through which to trust to memory for details. I am glad to say that the interval between experience and record is, as a matter of fact, usually much less than five years in the cases before us. Indeed, for a good many years past cases not recorded till five years after their occurrence have not been printed.

I am further ignoring a few cases where the evidence seems to me to be in some way or other too defective to be worth discussing. I do not mean to imply that the evidence for telepathy in all the cases retained is strong, or that they are all well recorded or corroborated. This is not so, and it may well be that some readers will think some of the cases retained might with advantage have been omitted. It is a question of degree, and it is only a few of the weakest that I have ignored. We might perhaps put it that some of the cases retained do not add to the evidence for telepathy, but granting telepathy it seems likely that it operated.

After eliminating cases for these three reasons—namely (a) that they have been already published in the *Proceedings* or in the books named above; (b) that they were not recorded sufficiently near the time of occurrence; (c) that the evidence is too weak—we are left with about 200, which I shall call the present collection, or our collection. It consists of some 30 experimental or semi-experimental cases, and 170 spontaneous experiences, in about one third of which the percipient was admittedly dreaming.

The exclusion from our collection of the 54 cases already published somewhat reduces its value, for these cases were of course selected as for some reason important

or interesting. It also somewhat alters the proportion in which different kinds of experiences are represented. Especially is this so with dreams, of which there are comparatively few among the published cases. In experimental cases the proportion is affected the other way, the number previously published being proportionately large and including a good many of the best.¹

In arranging our collection I begin, as Gurney did in *Phantasms of the Living*, with experimental and semi-experimental cases, to which Chapter I. is devoted, and proceed in Chapter II. to cases where the experiences of the percipients consist of ideas or mental pictures, or emotions or motor effects—cases that is where the phantasms are not externalised as waking sensory hallucinations nor as dreams with the same qualities. From this point on, however, my classification differs from Gurney's. He has treated separately dreams, "borderland" cases (that is experiences occurring when the percipient was in bed but believed himself to be awake), and hallucinations when the percipient was up and about; while I have treated these three classes together.

This departure from precedent needs some explanation and justification. In the first place, treating dreams and hallucinations together assumes that they can be regarded as in important respects experiences of the same kind, and in particular that, *e.g.*, the figures seen in our dreams, the characters that act in them and seem external to ourselves, are of the same nature as apparitions seen by waking percipients. That this is so is shown and strongly insisted on in Gurney's book, and, as he points out, cases are not infrequent where a dream figure is continued for an appreciable time after waking as a waking hallucination. It was not mainly the difference in their psychical nature that led Gurney to treat dreams and waking hallucinations separately, but the difference in their evidential value.

Though incidentally it did much else, his book chiefly

¹ The great majority of cases printed in the *Journal*, and afterwards published in *Proceedings* or in the books mentioned, were in early volumes of the *Journal*. There is only one after Vol. VIII.

aimed at producing a cumulative, quasi-statistical proof of telepathy by showing that a rare psychical event in the percipient's life, such as an apparition of the agent, coincided with a marked crisis in the latter's life much more often than any theory of probability warranted us in expecting. Now a dream is seldom a rare psychical event. Some dreams are more impressive than others, but, on the whole, dreaming is such a frequent experience, and the range of the possible contents of dreams so wide, that they seldom surprise us as a vivid sensory hallucination does. The probability of something in a dream corresponding with a crisis in the agent's life by pure chance is much greater than the probability that a waking hallucination will do so. And we have to consider in addition the ease with which dreams elude memory and the consequent danger of their being altered in recollection (if not noted at the time) to correspond with the subsequently learnt facts of the agent's experience.

But we may now, for the sake of argument at least, assume that Gurney's book has accomplished its object, and that telepathy is proved, and starting from that point may devote ourselves primarily to seeking for light on the occasions and mode of its operation.¹ From this point of view dreams have an advantage over most sensory hallucinations, for they have a chance of coinciding in a larger number of items with the agent's contemporary experience. In a realistic hallucination, the seeing for instance of an apparition of a dying agent standing in the room, the idea of the agent's personality is as a rule all that is conveyed to the percipient; the accessories, clothes, etc., seldom affording any evidence of being derived otherwise than from the percipient's own mind. If the agent and percipient have been in telepathic touch subliminally more completely than appears, it is

¹ In speaking of telepathy as proved, I do not of course mean that it is yet accepted by the scientific world. Much more accumulation of well evidenced instances will be required before this can be claimed. But we want more than the mere piling up of facts. Our facts will be the more readily accepted, the more we can compare them, and, provisionally assuming telepathy, show when and how it occurs.

subliminally only.¹ This meagreness in the content of sensory hallucinations is equally characteristic of veridical and non-veridical ones. But with dreams it is very different. In dreams, instead of being merely a spectator, the percipient is usually an actor, his own part in what seems to occur being part of the illusory impression. The dream represents dramatically an incident or little story in which the percipient is concerned. The details of the little drama may be in part veridical, and may thus amplify the communication from the agent. They may, on the other hand, even in veridical dreams (*e.g.* L. 1147, p. 196, and L. 1179, p. 195), be pure embroidery by the dream consciousness on the veridical basis, confusing the latter. The tendency to embroidery in dreams may be compared with the same tendency in automatic script and in trance speech, making discrimination between the true and the false difficult. Still, on the whole, we do in veridical dreams generally get more than the mere fact that the agent has appeared or his voice has been heard.

The principle of classification adopted will appear clearly as we proceed, and I need not describe it here more than I have already done. I ought to say, however, that I have not adhered to it quite strictly. In a few instances it has seemed better to take a case out of its proper order, so as to place it with another that resembles it in a way that seems interesting or instructive.

I have not quoted all the cases in full. Some I have so quoted. Others I have abbreviated, either by giving only the percipient's account without quoting corroborative statements or other evidence given in the *Journal*, or

¹ There are some hallucinations that reveal more. The rather rare type among spontaneous cases, which I have called visions—pictorial representations of the agent or others not forming part of the percipient's normal surroundings—may convey more information. (For an example see L. 1207, p. 243 below.) So of course may crystal visions. There are also some apparitions that seem to speak, and thus to convey information. In a very odd case, apparently well evidenced, in the *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 147 (not reproduced here, because it has been published in *Human Personality*, Vol. I., pp. 675-8), a conversation with the apparition is reported, quite as might happen in a dream.

otherwise. A good many I have merely described. The reason for this is chiefly to save space ; this paper being, I fear, almost intolerably long as it is.

The numbers attached to cases (such as M. Cl. 97 or L. 1215¹) are those they bear in the *Journal*, and which are also attached to the original documents kept at the Society's rooms. At the end of this paper I give a classified list of cases quoted or described in it, which will serve as a table of contents.

¹ The original meaning of the letters L, G, M, etc. need not be considered. In this paper they are merely part of the index number.

CHAPTER I.

EXPERIMENTAL AND SEMI-EXPERIMENTAL CASES.

§ 1 *Experimental Cases.*

By experimental cases I mean those in which the agent, or a group of agents, is deliberately trying to impress telepathically a particular percipient, and that percipient deliberately trying to receive an impression, as a rule from that particular agent or group of agents. In most of the cases of this sort recorded in the *Journal* the agent was endeavouring to impress the percipient with the idea of some object or action. These I do not propose to reprint here, as they would take considerable space and are in some sense a residuum, since the best cases of the same kind have been published in *Proceedings* or in the books mentioned above. Nevertheless, they have their value and ought not to be lost sight of, and it may therefore be useful to give the following list :

In the *Journal*, Vol. III., pp. 179-191, is a collection of experiments, consisting of series by different investigators, with agent and percipient in the same room. One of the contributors to this collection—Mrs. Shield, a careful and painstaking investigator much interested in our work—later sent some further series which are printed in the *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 189 and p. 296. Some similar series of experiments by Mr. Edmund Selous are printed in Vol. V., p. 184. Experiments of the same kind by Miss Campbell and Miss Despard will be found in Vol. VI., p. 4. The experiments at a distance by the same ladies have been published. Some similar experiments with agent and percipient in the same room, contributed by Professor Chattock, are printed in Vol. VIII., p. 302. From Dr. A. S. Wiltse—who, it will be recalled, has

contributed several important items of different kinds to our published records—there are three sets of similar experiments with agent and percipient in the same room, interspersed with a few in which facts at a distance seem to have been supernormally perceived. The records of these experiments are printed in the *Journal*, Vol. VII., pp. 197-206 and 240-242. There is also a short series furnished by Miss B. H. Grieve (see below, pp. 48, etc.) printed in the *Journal*, Vol. X., pp. 260-263. In this series some experiments were carried out when agent and percipient were apart, and some when they were together; and the series includes one veridical spontaneous impression derived by one of the ladies from (apparently) one of the two she had experimented with.

Experiments with agent and percipient in the same room having an obvious drawback in the difficulty of absolutely excluding the possibility of unconscious indications on the part of the agent, it is highly desirable that in serious experiments agent and percipient should, if possible, be in different rooms or separated by still greater distances; and the experiments more recently published in *Proceedings* have been so arranged. There were earlier also valuable experiments at a distance printed in the *Journal*, but these have all, I think, been subsequently published except one series by M. Glardon in the *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 98. This is referred to in *Human Personality*, but only a later and more strikingly successful series by the same agent and percipient (*Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 325) is published there in full.

There are two experiments in thought-transference with agent and percipient in the same room, which I will quote because the method was different—the percipient looking in a crystal with a view to seeing what the agent was trying to make her see. The percipient in the first case (M. Cl. 97, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 78), Miss Angus (pseudonym), is a remarkably successful crystal gazer, or “scryer,” and some of her crystal vision experiences, but not, I think, this particular one, have been described in *Human Personality*, Andrew Lang’s *Making of Religion*, and other books.

(M. Cl. 97.)

Miss Angus writes (January 4th, 1898) :

I had another successful scry on Tuesday evening, 21st December, 1897, when Mr. Mac—— asked me to look in the ball. He had never seen crystal gazing, so I told him to fix his mind on some scene, which I would endeavour to describe. Almost at once I saw a large room with a polished floor reflected, the lights being very bright and all round ; but the room was *empty*, which I thought very uninteresting ! Mr. Mac—— said how strange that was, as he had not, so far, been able to fix his mind on any particular *face* in the ballroom. However, he asked me to look again, and this time I saw a smaller room, very comfortably furnished, and at a small table under a bright light with a glass globe (no shade on the globe) sat a young girl, in a high-necked white blouse, apparently writing or reading. I could not see her face distinctly, but she was pale, with her hair drawn softly off her forehead (no fringe), and seemed to have rather small features.

Mr. Mac—— said my description quite tallied with the lady he was thinking of, a Miss ——, whom he had met for the first time at a ball a few nights before, but he had meant me to see her dressed as he met her in the ballroom.

We consulted our watches, and found that it was between 10.15 and 10.30 when we were scrying, and Mr. Mac—— said he would try to find out what Miss —— was doing at that hour. Fortunately I had not long to wait for his report, as he met her the next evening, and told her of my experiment. She was very much interested, I believe, and said it was all quite true ! She had been wearing a white blouse, and, as far as she remembers, she was still reading at 10.30 under a bright incandescent light, with a glass globe on it.

Mr. Mac—— writes (December 30th, 1897) :

I was at Miss Angus's house on Tuesday, December 21st, 1897. Miss Angus said that if I thought of some-

body she would look in her crystal ball and find out the personal appearance of the person of whom I was thinking, and what he or she was doing at that moment (10.25 p.m.). She told me to think of the surroundings and the place in which I had last seen the person of whom I was thinking. I thought of somebody that she did not know—Miss —, whom I had met at a dance on December 20th. I thought of the ballroom where I had been introduced to her, but at first I could not centre my mind on her face. Then Miss A. said that she saw a big room with a polished floor, and which was brilliantly lit up, but that at present she could not make out any people there. Then I succeeded in fixing my mind on Miss —'s face, when Miss A. said that she saw a girl with fair wavy hair either writing a letter or reading, but probably the former, under a lamp with a glass globe, and that she had a high-necked white blouse on. All this took about five minutes.

I saw Miss — again at a dance on December 22nd—the next night. I told her what had happened, and she said that, as far as she remembered, at 10.25 the night before she had been either writing a letter or reading, but probably writing, under an incandescent gas-light with a glass globe, and that she had been wearing a high-necked white blouse.

I had only known Miss Angus for a very short time, so she did not know what friends I had in —. I do not think that Miss Angus knows Miss —. There were three other people in the room all the time, one of whom was playing the piano. This is exactly what happened, as far as I can remember.

.

Although agent and percipient were apparently close together in this case, it is difficult to imagine how unconscious indications can have suggested the vision to the percipient, and it will be observed that in the second vision, a third mind, that of the lady of the vision, seems to have been more or less involved.

This perhaps happened also in the case to be next quoted (from the *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 71). The agent

.

in the case was again present with the percipient, and was trying to make her see a particular person in a glass of water.¹ The result seems to have been as in the last case, some perception of that person's dress and surroundings beyond the knowledge of the percipient, though perhaps not beyond her possible guessing.

The percipient, Miss N. Gernet, a Russian lady and Associate of the Society, writes :

ST. PETERSBURG, BASSEYNAYA, 33, Lodg. 4,
October 13th/25th, 1896.

Friday last, the 4th/16th of October, we had our first sitting this year ;—we, that is, Miss Marie Klado, an elderly lady, author of good stories for children, and a still better medium ; Miss S. T., an English girl (born here), my friend,—she is rather gifted psychically and wants to improve still more, but does not quite believe in spiritual powers ; myself.

At 8 in the evening we began. Miss Klado and Miss T. sat down near me, but not touching me. They were on a sofa in a corner of my study, and I was seated on a chair (or rather a low oriental seat) in front of them at a small table of black wood, uncovered, with a glass of water before me and two high candles lighted, giving the necessary brilliant spot to gaze at in the glass. Miss Klado never hypnotised me or even tried to, and I remain in my clairvoyant experience always perfectly awake and in my natural state, neither tired nor troubled anyhow. But her presence always helps me to see quicker and better, and I feel my own power “*électrisé*” through hers without any contact with her.

That evening her only *rôle* was then that of a “sympathetic current.” She sat and concentrated her thoughts as far as possible on the same subject as me.

Miss T. was nearer to me and, looking at me and at the glass, tried to suggest to me to see what she wanted,—that is, a certain person I never had seen or even

¹ Vision in a glass of water or other reflecting surface is, of course, of the same character as Crystal-vision.

heard of (she only told me it was a lady, but not who, and even had she done so, the name was unknown to me), whose surroundings and even the town or country she lived in were a mystery to me, as well as to Miss Klado. I had no clue whatever to what I could possibly see about this lady.

Now Miss T. did not know herself much about the lady; she has never been to her house and has heard little about her way of living, so that she could suggest to me the image of the person, but *not* of her pastime, dress, or rooms.

We looked what time it was (a little over eight), and proceeded to pry in the unknown lady's doings. As before, I always need some time to see anything when I have not practised for some months. After ten or twelve minutes gradually the usual very small picture was formed in the brilliant circle thrown by the lights in the glass (standing on a smooth white paper laid on the table). I seldom see any colour but black, white, and spots of light when there is a lamp, candles, or something of the sort (faces, when they are larger,—only the head seen, for instance—sometimes have their natural flesh colouring).

First I saw a slender woman with very fair hair and in a costume which puzzled me as well as her doings. I described *à mesure* all that went on in the glass, Miss T. saying nothing as yet. The figure began to move and I could then make out that she was dressing; she walked down the room, lifted her arms, took something from a board, then stayed in front of what was probably a mirror (I saw only the dark side), and dressed her hair on the forehead. Then she washed her hands, and the moving to and from me of her arms and of the *essuie-main* she held was perfectly distinct. She had a tea-gown of light colour with long (Greek) sleeves.

The scene changed all at once. I saw her in another room, better lighted, and a gentleman stood beside her, to whom she seemed to talk in an animated way. The gentleman was inclined to be stout, with a light beard and the hair a shade darker. When I came to this,

Miss T. burst out laughing and said, "Now I believe in it."

The description of the lady fitted to an astonishing degree, and in the gentleman Miss T. recognised one of her relatives, who was reported to be a devoted admirer of the lady. I broke off looking, the thought striking me for the first time that in such a way we may really intrude on our neighbour's private life and liberty. The lady living here, the next day my friend, meeting another of her own relatives, enquired whether any one of them had been at this lady's house. Then she came to me triumphant; the cousin I had seen had been there. The lady received him in a light gown with long sleeves.

Now her and his outward appearance could have been suggested to me by Miss T., as she knew both of them. But the visit at this very hour and the dress of the lady this none of us knew or could know.

So I think my experience was a success. Both [those present] and the family of Miss T. were witnesses to the facts being true and accurate, and told before asserting their reality.

N. GERNET.

Miss Klado writes :

ST. PETERSBURG, *November 14th/26th*, 1896.

Je confirme que tout ce que M^{lle} Gernet vous a raconté par rapport à sa vision de l'amie de M^{lle} T., s'est trouvé vérifié le lendemain de notre séance, et que M^{lle} Gernet n'avait aucune connaissance de la personne et des circonstances qu'elle voyait. A mesure qu'elle voyait, elle nous racontait ce qu'elle avait vu.

MARIE KLADO.

Miss S. T., who prefers that her name should not be given, sent Miss Gernet the following account, which was forwarded to us, of her recollections of the sitting.

Some time ago, a friend of mine, Miss Gernet, asked me to try water-gazing, and as I always felt a great interest in such subjects, I very willingly complied with her request.

A few days later we met, and for my part I cannot deny that our experiment was a complete success, as will be seen from the following account.

The person chosen by me, and of whom I was to think on that occasion, was unknown to my friend, nor was I ever in her house myself.

After gazing for some time into the water, my friend said that she saw a room, and described it to me and how it was furnished. Then further on she said that a human figure appeared, that of a slight fair-haired woman, dressed in a morning gown with wide sleeves, and which seemed to be either white or a pale blue; then my friend told me that she saw the door open and a gentleman enter the room; and on my friend describing his person, I recognised him at once.

The very next day I hastened to that lady's house, and questioned her as to where she was on the preceding evening, and how she was dressed. She told me that, feeling rather unwell, she remained the whole evening at home in her dressing room, and that she wore a pale blue dressing-gown that had wide sleeves! On examining her dressing room, I was astonished beyond words to find how very accurate the vision was, every detail of it.

Miss Gernet writes, when sending the above account:

[*December, 1896.*]

You will notice two differences with my version. (1) Miss T. says I told the lady was dressed in white or light blue. I said in reality only "light," as I do not see colours generally, and the whole dress seemed indeed whitish.

(2) The lady [is] reported to have stayed in her "dressing" room. Now there are no dressing-rooms (in the English sense of the word) as a rule in Russian houses, but boudoirs. When I saw her dressing, the room seemed half-lighted, rather dark; afterwards it was lighted well and the walls looked brighter, so I took it to be another room.

You may notice too that between my and Miss Klado's account and this one nearly a month elapsed, so that details are now, of course, less distinctly remembered. You are quite right that one should write it down immediately. . . .

N. GERNET.

If the mind of the person seen in the crystal or glass of water did in these two cases contribute to the vision, it was certainly unconsciously, so that to that extent they resemble the semi-experimental cases to be next considered.

§ 2. *Semi-experimental Cases. Percipient Experimenting.*

By a semi-experimental case I mean one in which either the percipient is trying to get an impression, or the agent is trying to produce one, while the other party to the experience is quite unaware that any attempt is being made, and unconscious of contributing to it in any way. Semi-experimental cases are dealt with by Gurney in his book as—what they of course are—transitional between experimental and spontaneous cases, but he only considers those where the agent was the experimenter. I think those where the percipient, with the hope of obtaining impressions supernormally, puts himself deliberately under conditions which he believes conducive to this result, as in scrying, automatic writing, etc., may well be regarded as semi-experimental too. And as throwing light on the telepathic process, such cases may be of considerable importance, for they show that sometimes at least the percipient is not like a blank sheet of paper, or a lantern screen, ready to receive impressions which the agent throws on it, but is himself the active party, and is like an explorer going out to see what he can find. The word “agent” is from this point of view not very happily chosen. It does not fit well where the active part is played by the percipient. Moreover, if success is possible without conscious activity on the part of the agent, it seems

to follow that we cannot tell either in fully experimental or in spontaneous cases how much of the successful transference is due to the agent and how much to the percipient. The share due respectively to one or the other may very likely differ in different cases. The agent in joint experiments generally concentrates his mind on the idea to be transferred if only for the sake of ear-marking it and distinguishing it from other ideas in his mind, but it does not follow that concentration is a necessary part of the process, or even contributes to the success. We are not justified in assuming from such experiments that the idea could not be transferred to the percipient unless the agent were consciously thinking of it.¹

In the majority of semi-experimental cases in our collection the percipient is the experimenter. They are of various kinds, and we may take first three which are crystal visions, and in that respect like the two cases already quoted.

The first (M. Cl. 93, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 124) was sent to us by Mr. Andrew Lang. He was well acquainted with all the witnesses, whose names were given us in confidence.

(M. Cl. 93.)

The following is the account of the seer :

ST. ANDREWS, *February 10th*, 1895.

On Sunday, January 20th, 1895, at about 5.30 p.m., I was crystal gazing and saw Miss M. L. in her drawing-room in —, sitting on a sofa, pouring out tea for a man in a blue serge suit, whose back was towards me. I noticed he had a brown moustache. Miss L. was dressed in a dark-coloured blouse with a lace covering over the shoulders. There was a lamp at Miss L.'s

¹For experiments when the activity seems to have been mainly on the side of the percipient, see Mr. Hubert Wales' paper in *Proceedings*, Vol. XXX., p. 124 *et seq.* Perhaps in such cases there is some quality in the passive agent which makes it possible for the percipient to get at certain parts of the contents of his mind.

left hand. I described what I had seen to her, and she said what I had seen was quite correct. R. T. B.

Miss M. L. writes :

Mr. B., *without explaining why*, asked me at a ball if I had been giving tea to a man on the previous Sunday afternoon. Such a thing is possible any Sunday ; but he then proceeded to describe my dress and also exactly where I was sitting, so much so, that I at once said that one of the blinds must have been up and that he had seen me from the other side of the road, which, however, proves impossible, as Mr. B. was in St. Andrews at the time.

He also described where the other man was sitting, with his back to the window, and I was on the sofa giving out tea, all of which I answered unwittingly in the affirmative. This is all I can remember. M. L.

Mr. B.'s sister writes to Mr. Lang :

February 12th, 1895.

I enclose the separate accounts. T. wrote his in St. Andrews on Sunday, and Miss L.'s was written yesterday in answer to my letter and without her having seen T. again. I am quite confident that he did see the picture, though he insists that it must have been a mere coincidence.

The next two cases (L. 1215, 1216, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., pp. 191-193) we owe to Sir William Barrett, who knows Mrs. Salis from whom he received them. Mrs. Salis writes :

(L. 1215.)

March 10, 1918.

My friend, Miss Taylor, has been able for some years to see visions in the crystal, which are 'often veridical. She always regretted not being able to hear what the "vision people" were saying, and I decided to try an experiment suggested by a French writer and induce clairaudience by using a shell. I first induced a slight hypnotic trance and suggested verbally that she would

be able to hear. I then woke her and told her to look in the crystal.

The first vision that appeared was the sitting-room in the house of Mr. T. B., a friend of hers who I have never seen. He was there with his brother and sister-in-law, and the room was minutely described. It was evening, and the gas lighted, and she saw the door open and a man come in. At this moment I said, "Place the shell to your ear." She did so, and to her delight she heard the newcomer exclaim, "There is good news to-night, we have taken another village." They then proceeded to talk about Mr. T. B. being called up and what arrangements he would make. Afterwards a maid came in with a tray of sandwiches and whisky and soda, and the vision then faded.

Four days after, Miss Taylor went to see the B.'s and said "I can tell you what you were doing on Saturday evening," and to their great astonishment did so, every detail being correct.

I may add that the expression "we have taken another village" appeared as a headline in the evening paper, but neither I nor Miss Taylor had seen it. I have never seen the B.'s nor the house in question.

This was in the early spring of 1917. MARY SALIS.

I append a signed statement [from the crystal gazer].

The above account is exactly what occurred. The vision was most distinct, and the voices quite clear. I have never before heard any voices, though I have always wished to do so. When I spoke to the B.'s they were extremely surprised, as it was all correct in every detail. E. M. TAYLOR.

March 11th, 1918.

Mrs. Salis writes: "I have been trying to get Mr. and Mrs. B. (the people described) to sign a statement, but cannot induce them to do so." She adds: "I have never used hypnotism except to induce 'clairaudience.' Miss Taylor sees the visions in a perfectly normal condition."

(L. 1216.)

Copy of notes made on Tuesday, February 12, 1918.

Last night at 9.45 E. T. looked in the crystal and saw Geoffrey sitting in a small room. It was very simply furnished, but there were a couple of armchairs, and some prints on the walls and a bright fire was burning. G. was alone and was reading a paper by the light of a lamp placed on a table by him. I asked about the situation of the house, and she said it appeared to have many trees near it, but it was quite dark outside. (It was just as if she went outside to look!) After a moment or two, she saw G. get up, put down the paper and take up a book. He then opened the door, turned out the lamp and went out, leaving the room in darkness.

M. SALIS.

Note. I wrote at once to my son and received a reply that all was correct. At the time I had no idea what kind of a building he was sleeping in nor where it was placed, but thought it belonged to Lord Tankerville.

April 17, 1918.

M. SALIS.

Mr. G. Salis writes :

WHITTINGHAM, NORTHUMBERLAND,

April 13, 1918.

The account my mother wrote me of Miss Elisa Taylor's vision in a crystal is remarkably accurate. I turned down the lamp before opening the door, and the shooting box in which I am living was built as the officer's mess of the Canadian Forestry Co. and belongs to Lord Ravensworth not Lord Tankerville. It is warmed by a huge log fire, and I am naturally saving of paraffin oil! A letter was written to me describing the vision a day or two after it occurred.

G. SALIS.

In answer to further enquiries Mr. G. Salis writes on April 22, 1918 :

(1) There are two green armchairs lent me by the Navy and Army Canteen Board—they are the most

striking furniture in an otherwise barely furnished room. There are 2 or 3 prints.

(2) The house is in a birch wood—trees growing right up to it. A larch and two birches also are in front and their branches sweep it.

(3) I get the *Times* every afternoon, by train,

(4) but do not have time to read it until the evening. I usually get finished about half-past nine and then pick up a book, which I read a little before the fire and then take to bed with me . . .

(Signed) GEOFFREY SALIS,

Officer in charge of attached Labour Board of Trade
Timber Supply Department with 112th Canadian
Forestry Corps, Whittingham, Northumberland.

The following day Mr. Salis wrote :

In my statement of yesterday I forgot to say that there are four coloured prints "hunting types" on the wall. They are the sole decoration (?) of the room.

It is of course very unfortunate that Mrs. Salis's efforts to get the testimony of the passive agents in Case (L. 1215) were unsuccessful, as it leaves the evidence for the veridicality of the vision somewhat weak. The auditory element—an induced auditory hallucination corresponding with the simultaneously induced visual hallucination—is, however, of great interest, and it is much to be desired that more experiments should be tried on this line.

The second case (L. 1216) is as complete as immediate record and subsequent verification can make it. The only difficulty is in judging how far the details of the vision might be the result of subconscious guessing—the facts of Mr. G. Salis being engaged in forestry work, and living in a shooting box, being known.

While on the subject of crystal-visions it may be convenient to compare with these semi-experimental ones an entirely spontaneous and more or less veridical vision in a glass of water (L. 1134, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 157).

(L. 1134.)

The case was kindly obtained for us by an Associate of the Society, the Rev. A. H. E. Lee, of 3 Cambrian Terrace, Holbeck Moor, Leeds. The full names and addresses of the witnesses were given to us, with a request not to print them.

The percipient, Mrs. H., writes :

LEEDS, *May 26th*, 1902.

On the night of April 16th I retired to bed feeling unusually depressed, placing a glass of water on the table for drinking during the night. My husband was on night duty at the time on the L.N.W. line. I awoke with a start about three o'clock in the morning, and feeling thirsty, reached out of bed for the water ; when about to partake of it, I saw, to my surprise, a moving picture in the glass, comprising waggons, and in the rear a guard's van ; as I looked they all appeared to smash into each other, and I noticed the van in particular was the most damaged. My husband came home about two hours later and told me that he passed the scene of the accident, and that the guard was seriously injured. I regard the above as something more than a mere coincidence.

Mr. H. writes :

I am a Goods Inspector on the L.N.W. Railway, and was travelling with a goods train to Manchester on the night of April 16th, 1902, and, after passing Ashton at 3.10 a.m. on the 17th, I passed the scene of an accident, which had occurred to our Leeds to London express goods train on the Micklehurst New Line, near Staley and Millbrook Station. It was distinctly visible to me and the goods guard I was travelling with, as the breakdown gang was out and large fires burning. On my returning from Manchester, I passed over the scene of the accident, and saw the waggons and guard's van, the latter being very badly damaged ; that was about 7.50 a.m. April 17th. On my reaching home, my wife told me of the vision she had seen.

The following are questions addressed by Mr. Lee to Mrs. H., with her answers appended, received by us on June 30th, 1902 :

(1) Why were you depressed ? Did you connect your depression with your husband ?

Ans. I was depressed on account of the child's illness, and worried owing to my husband's absence from home at such a time ; upon seeing the vision, I at once thought of my husband and wondered if he was safe.

(2) Did you see the time, or how did you know ?

Ans. At that time I lifted the clock off the mantel and placed it on the table, where I could see it without rising.

(3) Do you generally have water at your side ?

Ans. Every night, as the little girl generally asks for water during the night.

(4) Was the room lighted, or how did you see the picture ?

Ans. The gas was left burning, turned low, and there was a bright fire, as owing to the sickness it was always kept in.

(5) Did the whole train seem to smash up ?

Ans. When I saw the picture, there appeared to be a few waggons and a guard's van ; they all seemed to smash into each other.

(6) What time did your husband come home ?

Ans. About nine o'clock in the morning.

(7) Had you connected the vision with him, and felt anxious on that account ?

Ans. Yes.

(8) Did he tell you first, or you him ?

Ans. I told him first, and to my surprise he knew of the accident.

(9) Do you often have similar experiences and warnings ?

Ans. Very often, especially before sickness.

(10) Have you ever heard of crystal-gazing ?

Ans. Yes, but I have never looked through one.

In answer to further questions from us, Mr. H. wrote on August 13th, 1902 :

In answer to your letter of 16th ulto., I have been unavoidably busy or would have replied sooner.

(1) I was about a quarter of a mile from the scene of the accident when I passed at 3 a.m., and saw the men working on the line, there being great fires burning and numerous lanterns, but could not distinguish anything else distinctly.

(2) The accident occurred at about 10 p.m.

(3) I passed the scene a second time at 7.50 the next morning, and saw the brake van and one or two waggons which had been in the collision, and all very much broken up.

Thus it appears that at the time when Mrs. H. saw the vision, her husband had only seen that there was an accident, the details of which were indistinguishable to him, and it was not until about five hours later that he actually witnessed the details, which corresponded fairly closely to Mrs. H.'s vision. His connection with railway affairs would be likely to make his recollection of the times especially accurate; so that at first sight there might seem to be some difficulty in explaining the case by telepathy from him to his wife. We have to consider, however, that the mere knowledge that an accident had taken place would inevitably call up in the mind—especially of a railway man—some impression of the details of the scene, which would be more or less in accordance with the facts; and it is not clear that Mrs. H.'s vision accorded with them more closely than would such an impression. Thus the details of her vision might well have been derived from the impression produced in his mind on first passing the scene.

There is only one other crystal-vision case in our collection, and that was a vision shared by two percipients both consciously experimenting. They were casually trying whether, looking into the same crystal, they would both

see the same vision, and they at least approximately did so¹ (L. 1126, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 134).

(L. 1126.)

The account was sent to us through the kindness of Mr. Andrew Lang, one of the percipients, Miss Grieve, being a niece of his;² it was received on October 11th, 1901.

Miss Grieve writes :

THE LEASEOWES, HALESOWEN, WORCESTERSHIRE.

On June 24th C. and myself were reading anatomy together. C. took the crystal ball and I looked over her shoulder—both of us merely wondering if we should see the same thing. At the same moment the ball darkened, a white cloud came over the whole, and three pyramids appeared, a large one in front, the other two behind. Then a train of camels, some with riders, others being led, passed from left to right and disappeared behind the large pyramid. The vision lasted about one minute, and vanished simultaneously for both of us. We each wrote down as the things appeared, so as to be accurate; and I had no thoughts of pyramids in my mind.

B. H. GRIEVE.

Miss Grieve's friend gives her own recollections of the vision as follows :

On the 24th day of June, 1901, B. G. and myself were looking up muscles for an exam., and we had the crystal ball on the table.

We both looked into it casually, and I at least had no definite thoughts in my mind, when simultaneously we saw some pyramids appear, one large one in front

¹ It may be worth comparing an experiment described in *Proceedings*, Vol. VI., p. 434, in which a hallucinatory picture on a blank card which had been suggested to one hypnotised percipient was apparently transferred telepathically to another when she was shown the card. Compare also a collective vision in a mirror. *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 17, and *Proceedings*, Vol XXI., p. 463.

² For other experiences of Miss Grieve see p. 32 and 340.

and others behind, seemingly in a row, and coming round from the left to right a train of camels appeared. On the first one was a man, whose features I could not distinguish, as he was muffled up. Most of the other camels had large packages on their backs and were led. The procession passed slowly round the pyramid and then all vanished.

Another day I was looking into the ball by firelight hoping to see a favourite collie dog that had died a year previously.

The ball turned all black at first, then a light spot appeared in the centre and gradually spread nearly all over the ball. In the centre of this was a true portrait of the dog,—perfectly life-like. The vision only remained a few seconds.

CATHERINE COAD.

The second vision described by Miss Coad seems to show a special faculty on her part of vivid visualisation; it was, therefore, especially important to ascertain whether any conversation took place between her and Miss Grieve during the course of the vision, which might have suggested to her the same scene. In reply to questions on this point, and as to the notes made at the time, Miss Grieve writes to us:

October 17th, 1901.

. . . I am sorry to say I cannot send you the rough notes we made at the time; we left them here (at the college) last term and cannot find them anywhere now. . . . The descriptions were written immediately after seeing the vision, but before either of us said anything, and we did not speak while the vision lasted. . . .

BERTHA H. GRIEVE.

This scene does not seem to have been derived from anything external to the sryer's minds, nor could they trace any associations of ideas which might have suggested it. As moreover they did not speak till they had both written down what they saw, thus avoiding verbal suggestion, the concordance in their visions was apparently due to telepathy between them. With which of the ladies the vision started we cannot tell. Both have

on other occasions had telepathic experiences, sometimes as agent and sometimes as percipient.¹ Perhaps the most probable explanation of their collective crystal vision is that they both on this occasion acted in both capacities. Both were obviously percipients and both may have been agents—one starting the idea, but its development depending on action and reaction between their minds, operating as verbal suggestion might have done had they commented on what they saw as the vision proceeded.

In the case I will next quote (L. 1208, *Journal*, Vol. XVII., p. 235) there is, as in some crystal visions, a deliberate attempt to see something in connexion with a particular person, and apparently to see it in a definite position in space though without the use of artificial aid such as a crystal.

(L. 1208.)

We received the case from Mr. L. C. Powles, a member of the Society. The percipient was Mr. James W. Sharpe, late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

Mr. Powles' statement of the case is as follows :

THE HIGHLANDS, RYE, SUSSEX, *July 2, 1916.*

On Aug. 4, 1913, I had been invited by a friend, Miss B., living in the neighbouring town, some three miles off, to meet Mr. James W. Sharpe. On the afternoon of that day, therefore, I rode over to her house, leaving my wife, who was not well enough to accompany me, resting by herself.

At tea-time we talked, I think, entirely upon psychical matters, and I remember asking Mr. Sharpe if he saw "auras" round people, and, if so, what he saw round me. At first he saw nothing, but later he said: "You asked me to tell you; I do now see something." He saw two things behind me. (I now refer to my notes made

¹ Miss Coad was one of the three experimenters concerned in the short series of thought-transference experiments mentioned above as sent by Miss Grieve and recorded in the *Journal*, Vol. X., pp. 260-263.

the same evening on my return.) "One, a dark, not inimical,¹ half-human creature, with knotted hands placed upon my shoulders." This he said was "symbolical of illness near at hand—a warning."

Then appeared the "faint slight figure of a young woman with oval face, etc." (here follow some details which very well apply to my wife's appearance). She "tried to avert the illness."

When I came home towards six o'clock my wife told me she had been very anxious about my being out in the cold wind; also—and this is the important part of the case—she had been quite obsessed by a somewhat grotesque story of a man dressed up as a gorilla who comes up behind the master of the house and strangles him with his hands.

L. C. POWLES.

We have also received a statement from Mrs. Powles, as follows:

July 2, 1916.

I remember perfectly my husband going over to tea on Aug. 4, 1913, at our friend's house, Miss B.'s, and my being unable to go with him that day.

I was anxious about him, as he had only recently recovered from pneumonia, and there was a very cold wind. To pass the time and divert my thoughts I took up the *Strand Magazine*, and became absorbed in a very horrible story of a man disguised as a gorilla who came behind his enemy and broke his neck with his powerful hands.

I have always had a great horror of gorillas from childhood, and far-fetched as it was, I was made very nervous and oppressed by the story and longed for my husband's return. Immediately he came, I told him of the story and the absurdly nervous state it had left me in. This interested him extremely, and he then told me something of Mr. Sharpe's vision. He did not at the time describe it quite fully for fear of alarming me, and particularly did not mention that Mr. Sharpe thought it might be a Health-warning.

ISABEL G. POWLES.

¹ For comment on this word, see below.

It will be observed that these two statements were written on July 2, 1916, nearly three years after the occurrence of the incident to which they refer. Mr. Powles' statement, however, is based on notes made within a few hours of this incident, and we have been able to obtain further corroborative evidence in the form of a statement by Miss B.¹ who was present when the percipient, Mr. Sharpe, described his impressions, and also a letter written by Mr. Powles to Miss B. on the day after the incident occurred.

Miss B.'s statement, contained in a letter to Mr. Powles, which was written in reply to his enquiry whether she remembered Mr. Sharpe's "vision,"—is as follows :

July 27, 1916.

Certainly I remember Mr. Sharpe's "vision" on the 4th of August, 1913, and that you wrote to me on the following day giving me what you felt to be an explanation of it.

I remember that Mr. Sharpe said he seemed to see a non-human creature with his knotted hands on your shoulders, and that is the expression you used in your letter of the 5th of August, 1913, . . . I remember that Mr. Sharpe said it might be a health-warning, and that he also said he saw a young, oval-faced woman trying—as you say—to avert this monster's apparently evil intent. I enclose your letter to me of the 5th of August, 1913 (which I happened to keep), which gives the account of how Mrs. Powles read the story in the *Strand Magazine*.

M. B.

Letter from Mr. Powles to Miss B.

THE HIGHLANDS, RYE, SUSSEX, *August 5, 1913.*

With regard to the visions Mr. Sharp[e] saw behind me yesterday . . .

My wife *was* thinking much about my health—hoping I was not getting tired or sitting in draughts, but—and this is still more curious—she was also reading in the

¹ This lady's name and address are known to us, but are withheld here at her request.

"Strand" for July a horrible story about a man dressed as a gorilla who comes behind the master of the house and breaks his neck with his hands in the dark. This story quite oppressed her and might easily account for the "dark, non-human, creature behind me with his knotted hands on my shoulder." . . . L. C. POWLES.

Mr. Powles has informed us that in reply to an enquiry addressed to Mr. Sharpe, asking whether he remembered the incident described above, Mr. Sharpe wrote that

he does not remember the actual vision, but that by "inimical" (see above, p. 51) he meant a symbolical Health-warning or warning of trouble to come, but not actively hostile.

The "health-warning"—Mr. Powles tells us—"has not proved to be veridical, as I have not been ill at all since, and no disaster has happened."

The percipient, Mr. Sharpe, apparently interpreted his vision as a symbolic representation of his own impression concerning Mr. Powles' health. But the correspondence of the vision with what was in the mind of Mrs. Powles at a distance is very remarkable, and the element of oddness in it seems to remove any probability of its being accidental, or the result of fortunate subliminal guessing. If it was due to telepathy, Mr. Powles' mind must apparently have been concerned as well as that of Mrs. Powles, for it is improbable that Mr. Sharpe would have got into touch with her had her husband not been present.

There are in the collection two cases of visions at séances, experimental in the sense that the percipients had put themselves in the circumstances in which they knew themselves to be liable to experience such visions. In neither case was the vision recognised at the time, but in both it corresponded more or less with true events. It must be observed, however, that in neither case was there apparently any effort to get an impression about

particular events or connected with particular agents, and that in both we are told that the percipient frequently had visions of the kind, while we have not the material for judging how far and how often these visions were veridical. The experiences therefore share the evidential weakness of dreams, and our estimate of their value will depend on how far the amount of correspondence between vision and fact seems beyond what is likely to occur occasionally by chance. In the first (G. 267, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 170) the percipient has a vision, repeated after a short interval, of a small child setting fire to its clothes, some nine hours after the death, unknown to the percipient, of a little nephew from that cause, though the details of the accident and vision did not exactly correspond.

(G. 267.)

For the evidence in the case we are indebted to Mr. W. W. Baggally, who was acquainted with the principal witnesses in the case and has full confidence in their integrity. The percipient, Mr. John Polley, writes :

At a séance held within the sound of Big Ben on May 8th, 1901, there were present Mrs. E. V. M., Mr. Thomas Atwood, and myself. As Mr. Atwood resumed his seat after delivering an invocation (about 8.30 p.m.), I became aware of a vision, which presented itself on the left of where I was seated. The scene appeared as being some 5 feet distant from me, and displayed part of the interior of a room, viz., that part where the stove stood. The fire in the stove was small and dull, and close beside it was an overturned chair. In front of the fire was something that looked like a fire-guard or clothes-horse, but this was not quite clear to me. Playing or climbing over this article was a child, who fell forward, and, when it regained its feet, I noticed that its dress was on fire.

I made no reference to the matter at the time, as I had an impression that the vision might be connected with some occurrence in the family of Mrs. M., and I was averse to mentioning it for fear of awaking sad memories.

After some manifestations of movements of the table round which we were seated the whole vision was repeated, and this time I had an uncontrollable impulse to speak. Upon my describing what I had just seen for the second time, I was much relieved to hear that the matter was not recognised as being connected in any way with the sitters. I may mention here that the child appeared to be about three years old, and, judging from the style of dress, I described it as a girl, although the vision would apply equally well to a boy, as, at that early age, the short clothes worn by both sexes would be very similar.

Next Thursday morning, May 9th, 1901, upon awakening, I described to my wife the events of the previous evening's séance. On the evening of the same day, viz., Thursday, May 9th, I was out with a friend, and upon my return home at 11.5 p.m. my sister, Mary Louisa Polley (who resided with me at that time), made the remark, "I have a piece of bad news for you, Jack." "Well," I replied, "what is it? let me know," and she answered, "Brother George's little son Jackie has been burned to death." Like a flash I realised the connection of the sad event with my vision of the previous night. I then asked her (my sister), "How did you know this, and when?" She replied, "Mr. Fred Sinnett told me when he came over to see us this evening."

JOHN POLLEY.

The other two sitters confirmed Mr. Polley's statement in writing, and both Mrs. Polley and Mr. Polley's sister furnished written accounts of their knowledge of the matter as described in Mr. Polley's statement.

A local paper, which Mr. Baggally has sent us, containing an account of the inquest, gives the date of the accident as Tuesday, May 7th. The child was taken to a hospital immediately and there died. His father, Mr. F. G. Polley, a decorative painter, writes to Mr. Baggally in reply to his inquiries as follows:

6 ADPAR STREET, HALL PARK, PADDINGTON,
June 19th, 1901.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiry respecting my late son, John Frederick, I beg to say that on Tuesday,

May 7th, my wife went out to do some shopping, leaving my son, aged 2 years and 2 months, in a bed sitting-room with another brother, aged 7. Whilst the elder brother was getting some toys for them to play with, the deceased thrust some paper in the fire, pulled it out again, and set fire to his clothes. Some neighbours took him to the Children's Hospital, Paddington Green, where he passed away on Wednesday, May 8th, at 11.45 a.m. No intimation of this was given by myself or any member of our family to my brother, Mr. John Polley, until a friend of the family called at my address on Thursday, May the 9th, between 1 and 2 p.m., when we informed him of the sad loss we had sustained, and he told us he intended calling on my brother that evening, and we asked him if he would communicate the news to my brother and sister, who reside at Church Street, Stoke-Newington. Of course you know, sir, I am antagonistic to your views, but my brother has told me it is for the interests of science; if that is so, I take great pleasure in its furtherance.—Yours sincerely,

FREDERICK GEORGE POLLEY.

In a later letter to Mr. Baggally, Mr. F. G. Polley states that there was a fire-guard in the room; the little boy did not fall into the fire, but set himself on fire as described above.

Mr. Baggally himself writes further with regard to the case as follows:

December 4th, 1901.

. . . Mrs. M. is not a medium and does not profess to have any mediumistic powers. Mr. John Polley is accustomed to have impressions of a so-called clairvoyant and clairaudient nature, so is Mr. Thomas Atwood, but they are not public mediums. The vision referred to is not unique in the experience of Mr. J. Polley. . . . If I recollect rightly I saw the father of the child, Mr. G. F. Polley, on May 22nd, who handed to me the newspaper with the account of the accident. A few days after he sent me his written statement. I obtained the written statements of Mr. J. Polley, Mr. Atwood and Mrs. M.,

and Mrs. Elizabeth Polley in June. The statement of Miss Mary Louisa Polley I did not obtain till November, hence the delay in sending the account to the S.P.R. . . .

W. W. BAGGALLY.

The other case of the same sort (M.Cl. 22, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 73) was unfortunately not recorded till more than two and a half years after the event, and there are considerable differences in the accounts of the different witnesses, though they agree on the main point. Moreover the vision as remembered is less detailed than one could wish. As the whole account is long it will perhaps suffice if I only give an abstract of it.

In May 1888 four ladies at Denver, Colorado, were in the habit of meeting once a week to sit round a table "to see what would happen," one of them, Mrs. Logue, being a "medium so-called," though not a professional one, and frequently having impressions and visions. At one of these meetings Mrs. Logue had a vision of a man lying very ill and a tall pale lady writing—which vision she distinctly connected with one of the ladies present, Mrs. T. Mrs. T. did not at the time recognise it; but the next day she received a letter from a daughter in Indiana saying her husband was seriously ill, and the following day a telegram announced his death. He had died of pneumonia after a very short illness. Mrs. T.'s daughter had been writing a post-card to her mother at, or very near, the time of the séance. The description of her personal appearance was correct as far as it went. If the vision was telepathic the *rapport* between Mrs. Logue and Mrs. T., due to their sitting together, and between Mrs. T. and her daughter who was actually writing to her at about the time of the vision, may well have furnished a telepathic connexion such as would produce the vision.

There is a case (L. 1152, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 307) which may, I think, be conveniently considered with semi-experimental telepathic visions, though the percipient was not trying or expecting to see anything, but merely

talking of the friend she saw and looking at her photograph, and though the vision was apparently merely a mind's-eye vision not externalised. The actions and surroundings seen were not in themselves very striking, but the amount of correspondence between impressions and fact seems more than would be likely to occur by chance. With this case is given another, entirely spontaneous, in which the percipient in the first was apparently the agent, the percipient being her sister. This is interesting as apparently showing a family capacity to become conscious of telepathic impressions, and that capacity as agent and as percipient may be combined.

The two cases were obtained from Mrs. D. by Mr. J. G. Piddington, who saw the original letters referred to and himself copied them and talked over the incidents with Mrs. D. The full names and addresses of all the persons concerned were given to us with the request to print only initials.

(L. 1152.)

*Verbatim copy by J. G. P. of note written by Mrs. D. on
Saturday, January 27th, 1900.*

"Saturday, January 27th, 1900. This afternoon while I was sitting near the fire talking to L., I was holding a small photo. of Mrs. H. and describing her. 'Where is she now?' asked L. 'In Rome,' I answered, 'settled for the winter.' And as I spoke, suddenly I felt conscious of what she might be doing at the time. 'Do you know,' I went on, 'I think she must be just coming out of her room on to a high terrace such as we have here, only that there is green over it.' L. did not say 'nonsense,' but just asked quietly: 'What is she wearing?' 'A black skirt,' I answered, 'and a mauve blouse—she is looking out over many roofs and spires—and now she has gone back into the room and a maid is closing the shutters.' 'Can you see her room?' asked L. 'I think it is small;' I said, 'there is a cottage-piano and a writing-table near it. I think the large head of Hermes stands on it and something silver.' And then I felt nothing more and added, 'What nonsense I have been talking.' L. thinks there

may be some truth in the impression and wants me to write and ask Mrs. H. what she remembers of this afternoon. It was about six o'clock.

"I cannot say I saw anything; somehow I seemed to feel her surroundings were just so. I have never been to Rome, nor has she told me anything of where she lives beyond the address."

Copy of extracts, selected by J. G. P. from a letter addressed by Mrs. H. to Mrs. D. Postmark of envelope:
"6 2 00 Roma."

February 5th, 1900.

"Two days ago, as I was dressing in the morning, I was thinking of *you*. You had been so much in my thoughts for some days that I had really worried, wondering if you were still ill, or E. again. That morning as I awoke, thoughts of you came, and I determined to write you as soon as I had had my coffee. Imagine my surprise and delight, therefore, to receive your letter, a letter so full of interest to me, that I have had no rest since its arrival, in my great desire to answer it. I have really had no moment to call my own. The two days since it came seem like two weeks to me, for when one desires to do anything very much, the time seems long, doesn't it? [The writer then explains at length why she had been prevented from writing for two days.] . . .

"You have certainly, however, filled much of my thoughts these day[s],—and I have felt you in an extraordinary manner. You certainly have a power to visit your friends, and to see them, and to make them feel you. Your letter is absolutely startling and mysterious. And now I can answer it detail for detail, and item for item. [The writer then avows her belief in telepathy and clairvoyance.] . . . That you have peeped at me in my small Roman house is certainly a fact. As you state the facts, every small detail is not altogether exact, but the facts as a whole are true and exact and perfect, as you shall see. Your vision (if I may call it so) is so true and marvellous that on Sunday last, the 4th, about 3 p.m. (that was yesterday) as I was looking from my window in the salon

with Mr. S., watching a great funeral of one of Rome's best-loved Cardinals, I related your glimpse into my house, and I could not help exclaiming: 'perhaps Madame D. sees us now . . . as we are standing here in our window.'

"Let me begin by answering bit by bit all you say. I have a dear little vine-covered terrace, looking out into the Piazza di Spagna, and looking also right up to the spires or rather towers of S. Trinita dei Monti, with the great obelisk in front. The afternoon of Jan. 27th I returned to my home, after a walk and [after] making a few purchases, at 5 p.m. I took off my fur jacquette, and went at once into my dining-room to see about the dinner-table, as three friends came [or, 'come'] at 7 p.m. to dine. I busied myself about the table for some time, then stepped on to the terrace (which is so pretty, but opens, unfortunately, from the kitchen). I went into the terrace at that time to see about our dessert for dinner, which I had put there to become cool. Then I went back into the dining-room, and as the hanging-lamp had just been lighted, I ordered the maid to drop the outside curtains. She did so. I remember that I looked just then at the clock, and it was 5.35 p.m. I had on a black skirt, a black silk blouse, and a mauve tie, which twisted about my neck and hung in two ends to my waist. It looked to you like a mauve blouse. Then I went into our small salon and took something from the table. I remember it distinctly. Our salon is very small; there is an upright piano and a writing-table, on which are photos and books too, and a lot of little silver things. Hermes (your photo to me) stands very near, on another little table, quite near in fact. It is all quite mysterious. I believe you have really peeped into my house." . . .

[The letter concludes with a detailed description of how the writer spends her day; the description being given in response to a request from Mrs. D. In the course of it occur the following phrases]:

"You fairly startled me when you tell me that our acquaintance was made in just five days! I had never counted it, and yet you are perfectly right, it was just

five days, and made up of bits of time together and a few conversations. As I remember, you and I really never had one moment actually by ourselves. . . . You say truly that our intellectual friendship will have gone far ahead of the personal. Then French-reading and my piano and zither I bring in when a rainy day or spare moments offer. Tell me of your day, do. . . .”

[At an interview on 1st May, 1905, Mrs. D. gave J. G. P. the following information, mostly in answer to his questions]:

At the time of the incident in question Mrs. H. was little more than a *hotel* acquaintance. They had spent only 6 days together at an hotel, and had since corresponded. Mrs. D. knew Mrs. H. was a widow. When she had last seen her, Mrs. H. was in ‘slight mourning,’ white and black, Mrs. D. thinks. She does not remember to have seen her wearing mauve and black, or mauve at all. From a subsequent letter addressed to Mrs. D. by Mrs. H. it appears that the terrace was on a 3rd or 4th storey.

The head of Hermes was a gift to Mrs. H. from Mrs. D.

Mrs. D.’s note was made on the same evening as she received the impression, and on Miss T.’s advice. The name of the friend—L.—was Miss T. Miss T. is now dead.

Mrs. D. told J. G. P. that so far as she was aware, Mrs. H. did not play the piano, and at any rate she (Mrs. D.) had no notion she was musical. [See, however, the reference in Mrs. H.’s letter to piano and zither.]

The above, written on 3rd May, 1905, is an expanded version of notes made at interview on 1st May, 1905.

J. G. P.

[Copy of letter addressed by Mrs. C., then living at Liverpool, to her sister, Mrs. D., living at Athens. The English postmark shows the date of year “—84,” and the Greek postmark the day of month, viz. Dec. 10, i.e. Dec. 22, N.S.]:

Dec. 14th [1884].

“ . . . You may imagine with what delight we received your telegram [*i.e.* announcing birth of first baby]. . . .

You must know a very funny thing happened to me, and never again pooh-pooh presentiments. I told C. and Miss — and H. the very next day, so that they would not say it was my idea. On Thursday last, after having gone to sleep, I awoke suddenly with a sensation of some one being in my room. I sat up in bed and I saw you distinctly on a rocking-chair in a flannel loose blue dressing-gown. You were sitting up on the chair: I mean not leaning back, but stooping and rocking yourself as if in pain. It was so distinct that I forgot I was not there, and being, I suppose, myself half-asleep, said, 'Oh, J. has begun,' and was not frightened. Then you got up and went to the sofa, lay down, and then again to the chair. I then got so nervous, I got out of bed, went and washed my face with cold water, and got to bed and went to sleep. But again I awoke and *da capo* the same thing. That morning I told them that I was sure you had had the baby, and was disappointed at not having any news. I after[wards] forgot all about it, but when I heard you had had labour pains on that identical night, I am sure everything happened just as I saw it, and that when I went to sleep, so did you. Is it so? Tell me exactly what you did: if you were up, and if you sat on a rocking-chair and lay on the sofa, and if you slept at intervals. Lately, too, I have been very very nervous, and that may account for it, but see you I did as distinctly as possible.

. . . I hope we shall soon have news about you, as I am very anxious to hear particulars. . . ."

[On May 1, 1905, Mrs. D. told J. G. P. her sister knew of her approaching confinement. The blue dressing-gown had been made a few days before specially for the confinement, and her sister could not have known about it. In all respects Mrs. C.'s hallucination corresponded with the real facts.]

Mr. Piddington adds :

Mrs. D. is a quite first-class witness; a sensible, clear-headed woman, and most careful not to overstate things. She has "clear" dreams like those described by Dr. van

Eeden,¹ of which she has for many years kept a careful record, made in nearly every, if not in every, instance the day after the dream. These records I have read, and they give one the same favourable impression of her sincerity and honesty and exactness as does her conversation. The dreams are remarkable rather for their lifelike character, in which they are quite distinct from her ordinary dreams, than for their veridicality, but some are veridical, though not evidentially strong. In these dreams she has long and perfectly rational conversations with dead friends and relations, whom in her dream *she knows to be dead*.

Mrs. D. afterwards sent Mr. Piddington the following statement :

May 26th, 1905.

According to your expressed desire I write to tell you that the details of my sister's dream or vision, contained in her letter of the 14th December, 1884, corresponded exactly with the facts, my daughter having been born on the 30th of November of the same year, just as my sister saw it happening.

From visual impressions we may pass to cases of true impressions of fact not externalised as hallucinations received by a percipient who was experimenting. In one of these (L. 1164, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 130) the percipient has through a number of years sought for impressions concerning persons in her company, usually with contact. It is to be regretted that fuller records have not been preserved. Several of the instances mentioned were, however, recorded within the prescribed five years of their occurrence, and some are corroborated. One reason for giving the case in full is the percipient's interesting remarks about the way she gets the impressions—partly by observation and inference and partly apparently by telepathy, while in the latter case seemingly irrelevant association of ideas appears sometimes to play a curious part. The case was sent to Dr. Hodgson, and came to us from the American Branch of the Society.

¹ See *Proceedings, S.P.R.*, Vol. XVII., pp. 86 and 112.

(L. 1164.)

*Letter from Mr. G. V. Chase.*NEOSHO, Mo., *Mar. 7th*, 1900.

My dear Dr. Hodgson,—Anent my letter of yesterday let me give you a little experience—my first—with telepathy of the living.

Some seven or eight years ago my wife's sister, who is the wife of one of the editors of the "San Francisco Call" (newspaper) had an attack of La Grippe. Soon after her recovery she spontaneously developed this faculty in a wonderful degree, and in nearly every letter to her sister (my wife) she recounted some of her experiences. We were all avowed Agnostics. In August of 1895 I had occasion to visit San Francisco, and was of course the guest of Mrs. Adam, my sister-in-law, and her husband. Soon after my arrival I alluded to the subject and asked her to try to read *my* mind. She consented, and, taking my left hand in her left, she explained that under these conditions she had the best success, making her mind as complete a blank as it was possible. To this latter end she toyed aimlessly with a pack of cards lying in her lap—and waited for "impressions." After some time she announced that she got absolutely nothing, and said that with some she never had any success. I remarked that perhaps it was because I was not thinking of anything persistently or deeply. She replied by telling me to think of some occurrence of recent date—say some man I had met—his name and features. I thought of a gentleman I had met the morning before on the platform at Bakersfield as the train was changing engines. He stepped up to me, accosting me by name and said: "You don't remember me, do you?" I confessed that I did not. He said, "My name is Harris," and reminded me that some years ago when I was Aide-de-Camp to Gen. Howard, he came to our Headquarters in S. F. with a letter of introduction from my brother—and that I gave him a pass on the Government steamer "M'Dowall" for a trip about the bay. Even then I could not recall him. He told me he was going up to Grass Valley to look after some mining interests in a few days and hoped to see me in S. F.

Well, I thought of this man. Presently Mrs. A. said, "His name is of two syllables—accented on the first"—and then she asked me to signify assent if it was true—as it seemed to help her. I therefore said "Yes." After perhaps ten seconds she said, "It is a name that *sounds* like 'Parish,'" but, she added quickly, "That's not it"—a slight pause—"It is *Harris*." I, much astonished, said it was—when she added, "And his initials are 'C. H.,'" or whatever they were (I have now forgotten). I said that I did not know what his initials were. Then she began to describe the appearance of Mr. Harris, I assenting as she went on, and her description was as accurate as I could have given. A day or so afterwards she and I were going across the Bay to Berkeley to make a call, and arrived at the ferry depot just too late to catch the boat, and had to wait for the next one. As we sat in the waiting-room I saw this Mr. Harris enter, and at once went to him, shook hands, and brought him over and introduced him to my sister. I told him of the matter wherein his name figured; and before relating that part concerning his initials, I suddenly said, "By the way, Mr. Harris, what are your initials?" He said "C. H.," or whatever they were, but the *same* ones given by Mrs. A. It is of course possible and probable that his initials were upon the letter of introduction, but they were certainly gone from my conscious memory. Another instance:

Mr. Adam is an Englishman, and generally meets most of his countrymen of note who pass through S[an] F[rancisco], and sometimes brings them home. One (not sure which) evening at Mrs. A.'s "At Home" quite a number filled her parlour, and among them a young Englishman—a stranger Mr. A. had picked up somewhere. The conversation turned upon the subject of telepathy, and this young man expressed much doubt of its reality, but begged Mrs. A. to "see if she could get anything" for him. His hostess good-naturedly assented, prefacing the attempt with the remark that she often failed. Taking his hand—many of the company gathering about—after a moment she said, "I get the impression that you sold a lot to-day to a man, by the name of O'Brien, for 8000 dollars." "Oh,"

he laughed, "you are away off, for I never owned a lot, not even one in a graveyard; if I did, I think sometimes I'd go and occupy it." "Well," she said, "that's the impression I get." A lady who was sitting some eight feet from Mrs. Adam arose quickly and said, "That's the queerest thing that ever happened to me. I sold a lot to-day to a man by the name of O'Brien for eight thousand dollars." The faculty, whatever it is, apparently like other forces, acts or proceeds along the line of least resistance, and must therefore be like them, *natural*, and probably vibratory in its nature. This did not occur in my presence, but several others have. Mrs. Adam no doubt could furnish corroboration if addressed at 1449 Clay Street, S. F., Cal.

She possesses the faculty of pre-cognition to a wonderful degree. She is not a spiritualist, quite the reverse; is *intensely* prejudiced against the theory, or used to be; I have not seen her for two years.

G. V. CHASE.

From Mrs. Adam to Dr. Hodgson.

COLASI, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, *August 15th, 1902.*

Dear Doctor,—As you desire some record of my telepathic experiences and my own views as to their source, I take pleasure in sending you the following account which I gathered from old diaries. I greatly regret that more complete records have not been kept.

In February, 1893, the Olympic Athletic Club of San Francisco gave a fête for the benefit of its treasury, and I was asked to take charge of Sybil's booth. I had often read character from physiognomy and tricks of manner common to certain types, but prior to this I had never tried telepathy.

After the first evening in the booth I was walking home with a Britisher named Gadsden (now dead). As we walked along he said, "You don't really think you can tell anything, do you?" I replied that I claimed to have no occult gift whatever. He said, "No one in this city or in America, for that matter, knows my birth-place.

Could you tell me that, I would believe in telepathic communication."

After a short silence (during which I was holding his arm) I said, "Bonchurch in the Isle of Wight comes to me." My companion seemed much agitated, and said with surprise, "You are right, and now I am convinced that you have some peculiar power."

"Well," I replied, "I thought of Ventnor first, so you see I was only guessing."

"Still more wonderful," said Gadsden, "for I was born ten miles¹ from the coast midway between Bonchurch and Ventnor. I chose the question as being one impossible for you to answer unless you could read my mind."

Now, I look on that as a good case of pure mind-reading. I took courage from this experience, and during the rest of the fête I intrepidly read the past and future of those who came to my booth, and often with startling success, which I attribute, in part, to my own self-assurance.

Since 1893 I have told thousands of "fortunes" by impressions, and probably been successful with seventy-five out of a hundred. The greater number of trials have been with contact, though trials without contact, while on the whole not so successful, have sometimes given striking results.

Two years ago, at an evening at home, I was trying to get telepathic results for one of my guests. A strange lady, whom one of my friends had brought with her, was sitting behind me. I told the gentleman whose mind I was trying to read, that he had that day sold a piece of land to a man named O'Brien. He replied that I was wrong, as he had no land to sell. The stranger (a lady from Chicago whom I had never met before) said, "That is very strange, for *I* sold a piece of land to-day to a man named O'Brien."

There was in this case no personal contact.

One day during the Spanish-American war, my nephew, Mr. Chase, and I were watching the departure of some

¹ [There must, I think, be some mistake here as Bonchurch and Ventnor are within a mile or two of each other. E.M.S.]

troops for the front from the steps of a private residence. Just below us sat a little woman with a faded shawl over her shoulders. I had a strong impression about her, and told my nephew to ask her if her name was not Smith, and if she was not born in Dumfries, Scotland. Mr. Chase asked her name and the place of her birth, to which she answered, "Mary Smith, and I was born in Dumfries."

There was no contact in this case, but in the following the young woman was brushing my hair at the time.

I was once visiting a family named Randall, at Hustisford, Wis., and was rather attracted to a pretty servant girl who used to help me with my hair. One day while she was with me I had a strong impression concerning her, and asked her if her grandfather was not killed while crossing a river. She said she thought not, at least she had never heard of it. That night she went home to her mother (the daughter of a German pioneer), returning the next day very much excited, and saying that her mother had told her it was true; that her grandfather had been killed by the Indians while crossing the river with a boat-load of skins. The girl had no doubt heard the story in her childhood, but had forgotten it.

I have often turned to travelling companions and told them the month and place of their birth and have generally succeeded in getting their names. But in getting names I usually begin with the number of syllables, place the accent, get the initials, and then the whole name. This mode of procedure would lay me open to the charge of "fishing," and my own experience has shown me that where the "subject" was naturally very secretive, I have depended upon clues received in this way. With a good "subject" however this is not necessary, and the name generally comes to me immediately.

In 1897 I was introduced to a gentleman at the Savoy Hotel in San Francisco. His wife wished me to try and get his middle name. Upon taking his hand and closing my eyes I saw a large P and thought of an old friend whose name was Pettigrew. I told the gentleman that his middle name was Pettigrew, and was not surprised to have my guess confirmed. It is an interesting fact that

the names of friends often help me to get the names of strangers.

A few weeks ago the local telegraph operator asked me to tell him the names of his father and mother. The operator's name is Patteson. I took his hand, and immediately thought of a family of Pattersons whom I had known in girlhood. The head of the house was named William and his wife was named Jane. I accordingly told the operator that his father's name was William and his mother's name was either Jane or Jenney, to which he assented. (I add his testimony below.) These coincidences are of so frequent an occurrence that they have ceased to astonish me.

As to the sources of my impressions, I will say that I fully believe telepathy accounts for many but not all. I find that so constant a practice has developed my powers of observation and induction so that I have grown to depend upon them more and more. Reading of individual character drawn from a general knowledge of the type represented has always been a great aid to me. Moreover I believe that the "fishing" process may become so subtle and so habitual, that, coupled with a good observation and powers of rapid induction, it may be used unconsciously. And I have found that the majority of people are oblivious of those slight clues which they invariably give me.

A middle-aged woman, having a South German accent, came to me at a Church Fair where I had a booth. I noticed that she looked like a Luxemburg woman I had known in Europe, that she smelled slightly of carbolic acid, and that she had the assured air of one who earns her living. I also noted the inevitable marks of worry on her countenance.

I told her that she was born in Luxemburg, was a widow, a professional supporting two daughters, one an invalid, and that she had been brought up in the Catholic faith, to all of which she gave a wondering assent. Why she should have had two children instead of three I don't know, but all the rest was arrived at by observation and induction.

A short time prior to Feb. 1893 I had some heart trouble, but with that exception I have always had the best of health. When a girl I was often followed on the street by both men and women who later told me that they could not help it. And once at a theatre I was admiring a lady's gown through my opera glasses. A few moments later the lady in question came to where I was seated and said that she was dominated by an impulse that she could not explain.

MEDORA C. ADAM.

Messrs. J. C. Chase and Patteson corroborate Mrs. Adam's account :

I remember the episode related above by Mrs. Adam. During the war with Spain we were watching the troops from a neighbor's steps. My aunt told me that she had an impression regarding a woman just below her, and thought her name was Smith and that she was born in Dumfries. I asked the woman referred to and verified my aunt's impression. I do not think it possible that Mrs. Adam could have been acquainted with these facts.

J. C. CHASE.

Mrs. Adam told me that my father's name was William and my mother's name was Jenney, which was true. As Mrs. Adam is a stranger to me it would have been impossible for her to have learned these facts in any way.

LEWIS W. PATTESON.

The next case (M.Cl. 96, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 227), from a member of the Society, was experimental, for the percipient tried to get an impression about a particular fact, but whether it was telepathic is doubtful. That the impression may have been derived from knowledge possessed subconsciously by the housekeeper, is not, however, I think a strained hypothesis. We have several cases of emergence of the whereabouts of a lost object—its position having probably been subconsciously noticed by the dreamer at the time of the loss, but never consciously known. (See *Proceedings*, Vol. VIII., pp. 362-404 ;

also *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 30, and Vol. IX. p. 14.) For a case parallel to the present one, in that the finder was not the loser of the object, but one who had helped in a futile search for it, see *Proceedings*, Vol. XI., p. 397. But though telepathy from the housekeeper seems to me a plausible hypothesis, others may prefer to suppose either subconscious memory or clairvoyance in the percipient himself. Unlike the cases of finding lost objects just referred to, this experience appears to have been a waking one like that recounted, *Proceedings*, Vol. XI., p. 116, which suggested the experiment.

(M. Cl. 96.)

The Editor of the S.P.R. JOURNAL.

8, JASPER ROAD, S.E., *January 17th*, 1898.

DEAR SIR,—On the 15th of this month my housekeeper lost my latch key. She used it in the forenoon of that day for coming into the house, and missed it before she had occasion to go out again. Having searched for it in vain the best part of yesterday, she came to the conclusion that when she entered the house she must have left it in the lock and that it had been carried off by a tramp. I looked myself for the key in every likely place, and in its absence thought my housekeeper's conclusion was probably the right one. Last night I read the account in Vol. XI. *Proceedings S.P.R.*, of the lady who lost a book which was afterwards found on "the blue room bed." I said to myself "I wish I could find that key." "Where is it?" I asked my subliminal self, and the good Anthony, the patron saint of the Lost Property Office—put these words into my head: "It's in the kitchen table drawer." At breakfast this morning my housekeeper said she had not slept all night from worrying about that latch key. I remarked that I had dreamt it was in the kitchen table drawer. "Oh no, sir," she replied. "I've looked there and everywhere." I then went into the kitchen with her and opened the table drawer—and there found the key. My housekeeper was certainly as astonished as myself, and admitted that she hadn't looked in that particular drawer

for it as she *had never put it there before*. She supposes that in the present instance the drawer must have been a little open when she put her parcels on the table, and that the key at the same moment fell from her hand into it.—

Yours faithfully,

D. H. WILSON.

We wrote to Mr. Wilson for additional information; he replies as follows:—

8, JASPER ROAD, S.E., *January 23rd*, 1898.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your inquiries about the lost latch key incident:

1. I have never put the key in the kitchen table drawer.

2. The key is practically for the use of the housekeeper. There is but one latch key, and she keeps it. She is alone in the house all day, and requires it to let herself in when she goes shopping. She goes to her home at night and takes the key with her. Very rarely I ask her to leave the key with me when she is leaving. On Saturday last she missed the key when she was on the point of going home at night. She at once told me of it. I said “When did you have it last?” and she replied “To let myself in at about midday, and haven’t been out since, and no one has been into the house.” I said “It must be in the house, have a good look for it to-morrow.” The next day she looked for it “everywhere,”—excepting of course the right place. She says she never puts it in any drawer. She usually puts it in her pocket; occasionally she puts it *on* the kitchen table or dresser whilst she is disposing of her parcels. When she told me on Sunday that she couldn’t find the key, I went into the kitchen to look for it. I cast my eyes over the two dressers, on the hooks on them, and on nails in the walls, and on the mats; but I *did not look into any drawer*. It is very probable that the housekeeper had rested the key on the table, intending to place it at once in her pocket. Forgetting it, she may have later on swept it into the open drawer. I had little doubt on Sunday night that the key

had been left in the door at midday on Saturday, and had been carried off by some tramp or mischievous boy, and so thought my housekeeper.—Yours faithfully,

D. H. WILSON.

I have read Mr. Wilson's account of the key and say it is quite correct.

(Signed) JANE BRIGGS.

There are two cases which have not, I think, been published, in which the impression emerges through motor automatism—in one of them through table tilting and in the other through an ouija board. In the first (M. Aut. 104, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., 35) the experimenters were Mrs. Salter (then Miss Verrall) and the Rev. M. A. Bayfield. Other table tiltings of theirs have been published in an article by Mrs. Verrall in *Proceedings*, Vol. XXVI., and elsewhere. In this case a message was tilted out apparently intended to announce the death of Sir Michael Foster, which, unknown to the experimenters, had occurred some seventeen hours earlier.

(M. Aut. 104.)

Miss Verrall writes :

5 SELWYN GARDENS, CAMBRIDGE,
February 5th, 1907.

On Tuesday, January 29th, 1907, at 6 p.m., Mr. Bayfield and I endeavoured to obtain automatic "messages" by means of table-tilting, as we have done on several previous occasions. Since there was no other person in the room, we were compelled to record the messages ourselves, and consequently to follow them word by word; we were not, however, able for the most part to form any expectation of what the next word was likely to be, and our expectations, when we did form any, proved as often as not incorrect. It is evident, therefore, that the general tenour of the messages can have been little affected by our conscious thoughts. The following statement was obtained; the questions asked by us are in brackets.

Fellow of Royal Society. (What was his name?) *Potter.* (What about him?) *Died this afternoon.* (What time?) *4.30.* (Can you tell us more about him?) *Edditor* (sic) *of Physiological Review.* (Where did he live?) *London.* (What address?) *43 Belsize Gardens, Kensington.* (Was he married?) *Yes.* (Had he any children?) *Yes, five.*

At the time this message conveyed nothing either to Mr. Bayfield and me or to my father, Dr. Verrall, to whom it was shown on Tuesday evening; we considered it indeed of so little value that we discouraged any further communications on the subject, and tried to direct the phenomena into what we considered more "evidential" channels.

We thought no more of the matter until we heard on Wednesday afternoon of the death of Sir Michael Foster, which took place, as we learnt by subsequent enquiry, early in the morning of Tuesday, January 29th. It was not, however, publicly announced until Wednesday, and on Tuesday was known in Cambridge only to a very small number of people, apparently four. That the news did not spread is clearly shown by the fact that it did not appear in any paper until Wednesday afternoon. The names of those who are known to have received the news on Tuesday have been told to us, and it appears certain that neither Mr. Bayfield nor I can have come into any sort of contact with them in the course of that day. If that be so, the "message" obtained by us, unless it is to be regarded as a mere coincidence, must have been obtained by some other than the normally recognised means of communication.

With regard to the question of coincidence, it may be noted that—setting aside for the moment details given in reply to leading questions, which will be considered later—our message can be stated thus: A Fellow of the Royal Society (*a*), by name Potter (*b*), and Editor of the *Physiological Review* (*c*), has died this afternoon (*d*). Of these statements, as applied to Sir Michael Foster, (*a*) is correct; (*c*) is also correct, except for the discrepancy between *Review* and *Journal*. "Sir M. Foster founded and edited the *Journal of Physiology*." (See

obituary notice in the *Times* of Jan. 31.) (b) is not correct, but there is a close resemblance between the two names, four out of the whole six letters being right and in the right place. The description (c) is distinctive; there are only two people to whom it could up to the present ever have been applied, Sir M. Foster and the present editor, Professor J. N. Langley, whose name, it will be seen, does not bear the least resemblance to "Potter." (a), (b), and (c) combined would appear therefore to point to one man only, Sir M. Foster, who is stated to have died on Tuesday afternoon (d), and died as a fact on Tuesday morning.

The further details given, such as the hour and place of death, are almost all incorrect, but it should be noticed that they were given in reply to leading questions, and it is my impression, based on previous experience, that in the case of automatic messages statements so obtained are seldom trustworthy. For instance, 43 Belsize Road, Hampstead, is, as I afterwards remembered, an address with which I was once familiar; the address given in the message of January 29th is evidently a variation on this. On the other hand, the three statements numbered above (a), (c), (d), were given either spontaneously or in answer to questions so vague as to afford practically no guidance or restriction to the answers. (b)—a partially correct answer—was, I think, given in reply to a definite question; but on this point Mr. Bayfield's recollections differ from mine; he thinks that the first question asked was "What about him?"

Mr. Bayfield and I have sat for automatic phenomena of this kind on 17 occasions. This is the only time that we have produced a statement that some one had recently died.

HELEN DE G. VERRALL.

Statements follow in the *Journal* as to what Miss Verrall and Mr. Bayfield were doing during the earlier part of the day when the message was received, showing that they had had no opportunity of hearing the news by normal means. Also particulars about the death and when it was known at Cambridge and a transcript of

the note made at the time of the whole message tilted by the table, are given. I omit these for brevity.

It is to be noted that in this case the "message" was received by persons who had no special personal interest in it, beyond that of any one connected with the University in which Sir Michael Foster had for some thirty-five years played so prominent a part. It belongs therefore to a class of cases of which other instances will be found below among spontaneous cases, where it is difficult to point to a particular agent (see below pp. 344 *et seq.*).

In the Ouija board case, the communicator apparently purported to be the dead son of one of the three experimenters, and the "message" conveyed a trivial fact about a living son which was both unknown to, and unlikely to be guessed by, the sitters (M. Aut. 105, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., pp. 211-217). The case came to us from the late American Branch of the Society, having been left among Dr. Hodgson's papers. I abbreviate the narrative considerably.

(M. Aut. 105.)

Mrs. Booth writing on September 11, 1896, recounts how she and a friend, Miss Loop, left Great Barrington on June 16 of that year to stay with a friend, Mrs. Orcutt, at a place about seven hours' journey away. Mrs. Orcutt had been very kind to Mrs. Booth's dead son Le Roy in his last illness, but the ladies had apparently no conscious thought of communication from him when on the evening of June 18 they sat down to amuse themselves with the Ouija board. Mrs. Orcutt and Miss Loop had their hands on the board, which at once moved rapidly, pointing to letters, but apparently at random and so fast that they could not follow it. However, Mrs. Booth got a pencil and paper and put down the letters indicated as well as she could, but without deciphering what was said till the end of the first paragraph. At that point Miss Loop wished to stop, but Mrs. Orcutt caught her name and thought something might be coming. So they

started again, and then caught the words of the last paragraph as they came out. The following is a copy of what Mrs. Booth noted :

Y e s - G U I D E - u - s - e - | w i - t - h | - e - f - e - r - e -
y | e - f - w - l - i - (m) - s - f - h - a - r - l - e - s - c - b o - o
- t - h - i - s - j - u - s - t - g i - v - e - n - p - i - t - t - s - f - i
- e - l - d - a - i - s - i - t - d - i - d - y - o - u - k - n - o - w
- i - t - o - r - n - o - t - i - f - y - o - u - w - a - n - t - t - o -
y - (to) - r - o - y - a - m - p - u - t - o - r - r e - u - t - t

R o y | i - s | - d - e - a - d | - h - e | - i - s | - g - l - a - d |
- y - o - u | - a - r - e | - h - e - r - e | - w - i - t - h | - M - r - s
- o - r - c - u - t - t | - I | - w i - s - h | - i - | c - o - u - l - d |
b - e | - t - h - e - r - e | - t - o - o - | w - i - t - h - | y - o - u -

She tells us that a letter in brackets means that it was doubtful. If we adopt her suggestion that "in the word Charles, the c, which should come first, is placed after the harles—as if it were a correction" we find in the middle of the first incoherent paragraph,

"Charles Booth is just given Pittsfield a [v]isit, did you know it or not."

None of the ladies had any reason to think that Mrs. Booth's son Charles, who had remained at home at Great Barrington, would have visited Pittsfield, and they thought it "not at all likely to be true." However, on returning home a few days later Mrs. Booth found that, as a matter of fact, Mr. Charles Booth had been over to Pittsfield on business on the afternoon of Monday, June 16, after she left home.

In reply to Dr. Hodgson's request, the written corroboration of Mrs. Orcutt, Miss Loop, and Mr. Booth was given.

This concludes the semi-experimental telepathic cases in which the percipient is the experimenter.

§ 3. *Semi-experimental Cases. Agent Experimenting.*

Of cases in which the agent experiments we have in the collection six—two in which the agent appears to the percipient, and four in which the agent influences the percipient from a distance. Of the four latter, one is a case of hypnotisation at a distance, described in the

course of an article by Professor Alexander of Rio de Janeiro, entitled "Supernormal Phenomena observed during Hypnotic Treatment by Dr. Alfredo Barcellos of Rio de Janeiro." Dr. Barcellos was in the habit of using hypnotism for curative purposes, and besides the hypnotisation of his patient E. from a distance, the article includes instances of telepathic clairvoyance and premonition exhibited by another patient. I will here content myself with referring to the article, which is printed in the *Journal*, Vol. VIII., pp. 88-95 and 99-116. The case of hypnotisation at a distance will be found in the first part of the article, with some confirmatory evidence in the second part.

I will quote next two experiments in which a lady succeeded in telepathically inducing a friend to come to her. They are included under L. 996, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 193, and came to us through the late American Branch of the Society. It is much to be regretted that no note was made of either experiment before its success was known.

(L. 996.)

The agent, Mrs. Lee, writes :

SHREWSBURY, MASS., *December 7th*, 1891.

An interesting experiment I tried last winter. A friend of sensitive temperament occupied a room (in a foreign country) next my own. The connecting door between the two was closed. The lady was writing (as she afterwards told me). Wishing to see her, I intended to go to her, but as I was comfortably resting on the lounge, I met the recalcitrant disposition to move with the mental question, "How long will we be slaves to matter, time and space?" Whereupon it occurred to me to exert a strong mental effort instead of a slight physical one. In about five minutes it proved successful! I heard steps approaching the door. To my summons in response to her rap, she opened the door, "Did you call me? I was under the impression that you did, but was not sure

I heard you." I explained. My friend replied that she was conscious of me a moment or two before she put down her pen to come to me.

MARY HOLLAND LEE.

In answer to Dr. Hodgson's request for a corroborative statement from the lady on whom the experiment was tried, Mrs. Lee wrote :

August 22nd, 1893.

The answer to your letter I delayed until I heard from Miss S. I wrote to her to make a statement of the telepathic experiment between us when at Mentone, France. I enclose her letter.

The letter enclosed was as follows :

DEAR MRS. LEE,—I do remember the time of which you speak, when we were in Mentone, and you drew me to you by a little mental telepathy. I think I was writing to E. D. in my room, which adjoined yours. Suddenly my train of thought was broken into by a feeling that I must go to you. I felt that you needed me for something, without stopping to think what that something might be. But I knew that some invisible power had hold of me, calling me. I then stepped to your door, and asked you if you had spoken or if you wanted anything, and you immediately told me that it was but an experiment on your part to prove the power of mind over matter. It was certainly successful that time and has been at other times, when we have been separated by miles of distance.

(Signed) E—— S——, [full name given].

No details were given as to the other experiments referred to by Miss S., but a similar experiment tried by Mrs. Lee in the case of another friend, Mrs. Chenoweth, was related by the latter in the *Medico-Legal Journal*, Vol. I., No. 3, June, 1893, as follows :

A lady whom I shall call Mrs. L., my friend since my own girlhood, and, with myself, a member of the American

Branch of the London Society for Psychical Research, had a trifling experiment in telepathy with me in the month of August, 1892, which was so simple and successful that it seems worth telling.

We spent the summer in a charming New England village; I living near the top of a long hill, and she half way down, the houses of both facing upon the one broad avenue which makes the main street of the village.

We saw one another daily, but on the day in August above referred to, the date of which is mislaid, we had passed hours together, and parted near six o'clock in the afternoon, when I went home to tea, averring laughingly at parting that it could not be promised when I should come again, since we could surely think of nothing more to say to one another for days.

At nine o'clock that evening I found my thoughts turning with strange persistence toward Mrs. L. It seemed to me that she was in need of me, and I felt impelled to go to her. In vain I argued that if it were a matter of importance she would come to me, or send for me. The silent call continued.

After the lapse of half-an-hour I turned to a friend, and asked if she felt able to walk down to Mrs. L.'s with me, reluctantly asking, as she was suffering somewhat from a lame foot. She was incredulous, and repeated to me my own assertion that I probably should not go down there again within a week. At last I said emphatically, "It is, indeed, very strange, but I can no longer resist the inclination to go and see if anything is wrong with Mrs. L."

My friend accompanied me, with some effort. It was now half-past nine o'clock. We found Mrs. L. sitting on the piazza alone, in the moonlight.

She cried out to me delightedly upon hearing my footsteps: "I have spent full half-an-hour calling to you to come."

C. VAN D. CHENOWETH.

Mrs. Lee adds:

This instance occurred as herein stated, *verbatim et literatim*.

MRS. MARY HOLLAND LEE.

The lady who accompanied Mrs. Chenoweth to Mrs. Lee's house on this occasion, writes to Dr. Hodgson :

July 25th, 1894.

I perfectly recall the circumstance referred to in the little sketches sent you by Mrs. Chenoweth and Mrs. Lee. I walked down with Mrs. Chenoweth to Mrs. Lee's house and heard Mrs. Lee say that she had spent half-an-hour in "willing" the visit.

In connexion with these experiments of Mrs. Lee's must be mentioned a "Diary of Telepathic Impressions" printed in the *Journal*, Vol. VII., pp. 299-306 and 311-319. It is the telepathic diary for the year 1894 of a certain Mrs. S. It came to us through Dr. Thomas Duke of Rugby, who was her medical attendant, and who assured us that every word she has written may be depended on. A good many of the impressions are spontaneous ones, received by Mrs. S., about what other people are thinking or doing—generally in connexion with herself. But a great many attempts by herself to influence other people at a distance—especially Dr. Duke—to come to her, or send things, or do something, are recorded. These attempts sometimes failed, as appears from the diary, but much more often succeeded. The incidents are almost all of a trivial character, and almost any one of the coincidences, taken alone, might be explained as the result of chance, or lucky guessing, or common associations of ideas. The weight of the record lies in the great number of coincidences—a number which certainly seems far beyond what is probable unless telepathy was at work. One could wish that more corroboration had been possible, but there is some. I do not reproduce the diary here because of its length, but it is, I think, a record of very considerable importance.

Experiments in which the agent appears to the percipient are of course of great interest on account of their analogy to spontaneous apparitions at the time of the death, or of a crisis in the life, of the agent. Accounts of

a few such cases were printed in the *Journal* in the 'eighties and 'nineties (since then none have been received by the Society), but the best of them are published in *Proceedings* or the books named above. The two that remain are neither of them very satisfactorily recorded, while the first also suffers from the weakness that agent and percipient were in the same room. Nevertheless they are both of considerable interest and worth quoting.

It will be observed that in the first case (L. 851, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 323) the agent did not try to appear to the percipient; the apparition was the result of his trying to make her think of him. In this it resembles the case of Baron von Schrenck Notzing (see *Journal*, Vol. III., p. 307, and Podmore's book). The account of the case comes to us through the late American Branch. I abbreviate it somewhat.

(L. 851.)

The agent, Mr. Warner, writes :

242 W. 4TH STREET, CINCINNATI,
OHIO, November 14, 1887.

About three years ago, or less, my brother, in his letter to me, endeavoured to interest me in some phenomena which had come under his observation. . . . My employment is that of "book pressman," running two large book presses (Adams) printing school books. The lady [Miss Mallou] is one of two female "feeders" directly under my charge, one feeder for each press. She has held that position for the last four or five years. She is about forty-five years old and intelligent, right-minded, and kind-hearted, morally above suspicion.

One of the experiments which my brother had suggested for me to try to satisfy myself was to try what the effect might be of looking at and thinking of a person at the same time. This is the history of the first experiment.

Date, early March, 1886; time of day, middle of forenoon; place, press room. Both of my presses stopped

at the time and the lady sitting with her back turned toward me, at a distance of 15 feet, myself engaged on the second press, in inspecting and carrying away a heap of printed paper, she reading the fashion column of a newspaper (as I afterwards learned). Suddenly the idea occurred to me, "Why not try that experiment now?" Instantly I turned toward her, concentrating my look upon the centre of the back of her head and mentally calling her first name. I remained in that position for five or six seconds, then turned to my work, thinking that experiment a failure, as I saw no signs otherwise. Between 25 and 30 minutes (by the clock) afterwards, she arose, and coming toward me with a hesitating step and a perplexed half smile on her face, said, "Warner, were you trying to make me look at you a while ago?" "Well, how long ago?" said I. "About half an hour ago," said she. "Perhaps I was," said I. "How did I appear to you?" "Well," said she, "I wasn't much interested in what I was reading, and all at once the letters seemed to run together, and your form and face appeared in a wavering, unsteady way, just to the left, in front of me. You had a smile on your face, a piece of waste paper in each hand, and your arm seemed to be resting on a table or something." This was an equal surprise to both of us at the time, although since then I have verified it with somewhat similar experiments upon other ladies and repeatedly with this one.

Later Mr. Warner adds :

The description which Miss Mallou gave of my attitude . . . was in most exact accord with the actual facts. Very many times since then she has actually seen me without use of the eyes, while in her vicinity, and when my attention was not specially turned towards her ; at other times, at my will, she would "sense" me that I was looking at her by a perception as of a flood of light coming over her eyes

In making this experiment I only hoped to call her attention, by causing her to feel me or my influence.

The projection of my personal appearance was an equal astonishment to us both. . . . In reply to your question I have . . . not, so far, to my knowledge, succeeded in projecting my personal appearance on any other subject than Miss Mallou.

Miss Mallou, having seen Mr. Warner's account, writes on November 30, 1887 :

I do not think it necessary to write more, only to say that what he has written is correct, and I could not explain more fully than he has done. . . .

She adds on December 16, 1887 :

In answer to your questions of the 8th, I can only say I have always thought what I have seen has been clairvoyantly. . . . I have always (it seems to me) had this power of seeing [hallucinatory figures], but when I have told things I have seen, I have been laughed at and told it was my imagination. . . . I think the reason I did not turn and look at Mr. Warner was, I was annoyed, I felt he was looking at me, and when I saw the form come round from my left side (I was leaning with left arm on window sill) I did not know what to think or do, so I said to myself, "I won't turn, or let him know anything about this," but the more I thought, I was annoyed, and to satisfy myself (or, as he says, woman's curiosity) I asked him if he had been trying any experiments on me, and told him why I thought he had been.

LIZZIE A. MALLOU.

The other similar case (L. 1076, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 250) would probably have been as good as any we have if only a record had been made of the experiences at the time. As it is, we depend on memory after several years. We owe the case to the same Mr. L. C. Powles who sent us the gorilla case (L. 1208) described above, p. 50. He was personally acquainted with all the persons concerned. I partly abbreviate the account.

(L. 1076,)

The percipient, Mrs. E., wrote on February 12, 1896 :

Though unable to give the date of these strange incidents which I have experienced, yet I will try and be as exact as possible in my relation. I have not, I think, forgotten any detail, for all is still impressed very vividly upon my memory.

Mrs. E. then describes a disturbed night experienced by herself and her daughter Mrs. A., and unexplained bell ringing heard by a maid, and continues :

On the Sunday evening after this, some friends were supping with me (my daughter had returned home), and before we had finished Mr. Rose came in. He drew a chair to the table and my son said, "Well, Rose, what have you been doing lately?" His reply startled me, for he answered, "My last effort has been trying to send my 'spook' here." I asked him to explain what he meant and then he told me about it. It was the first time I had heard that such a thing was possible, and I then told him of the ringing of the bell on that same evening.

This subject was not discussed again by us as far as I can recollect, nor did it impress me particularly; and some weeks passed, when I was struck down with a bad attack of influenza, and again my daughter came to nurse me.

I had quite recovered, but had not yet been out of my room, but was to go into the drawing-room next day. On this particular night, my daughter had gone to the theatre and my son remained with me. He had bid me good night about half-past ten and gone to his room, and I lay reading, when suddenly a strange creepy sensation came over me, and I felt my eyes drawn towards the left hand side of the room. I felt I must look, and there distinct against the curtain was a blue luminous mist.

I could not for some time move my eyes away, and all the time I was really terrified, for I thought it was something uncanny. I wished to call my son, but fought down the feeling, knowing I should only upset him if he thought I was nervous, and possibly they would think

I was going to be ill again. So I battled down my fears, and making up my mind it was all imagination, turned round with my back to this misty light and continued my book. Soon the feeling of fear passed away; but all desire for sleep had also gone, and for a long time I lay reading,—when again quite suddenly came the dread and the feeling of awe.

This time I was impelled to cast my eyes downward to the side of my bed, and there, creeping upwards towards me, was the same blue luminous mist. I was too terrified to move, and remember keeping my book straight up before my face as though to ward off a blow, at the same time exerting all my strength of will and determination not to be afraid,—when suddenly, as if with a jerk, above the top of my book came the brow and eyes of Mr. Rose. In an instant all fear left me. I dropped my book with an exclamation not complimentary, for then I knew that Mr. Rose had been trying the same thing again. In one moment mist and face were gone.

Next morning I told my daughter, and she said she had had the same restless night (though sleeping in another room) as when the bells rang and we had both felt as if something uncanny were in the room.

That day Mr. Rose came to see me, and *before* telling him anything of my experience, I asked him what he had been doing the night before. His answer was, "I went to my room early and concentrated all my thoughts in trying to send my astral body here."

I then repeated to him what I have written here, and Mr. Rose promised he would not experiment on me again, as it made me nervous.

An independent account by Mrs. A. written about a week earlier corroborates the main points in this narrative. Mrs. A. thought the events had occurred two or three years ago.

The agent's account of his side of the incident is contained in a letter to Mr. Powles, as follows :

4 CROMWELL CRESCENT, S.W. *January 18th, 1896.*

DEAR MR. POWLES,—The evidence I have to give in the case of "spirit projection" is very little by itself ;

but as you have heard the story and will have the evidence of Mrs. E. and Mrs. A., I shall confine myself to that which comes within my own knowledge. As an author (having written several novels) I am, of course, somewhat imaginative, though I incline rather to the realistic than to the romantic school. I have also read and taken much interest in so-called occult phenomena. I should also mention that I had mesmerised Mrs. E. with more or less success on several occasions before making the experiment I am going to relate.

Having read of cases of spirit projection, I resolved, without mentioning the fact to any one, to endeavour to send my astral body to Mrs. E. It was about 1891 or 1892, though my memory for dates is so bad that I can't be certain as to the time. This will no doubt be fixed by others. I sat in my bedroom about half past twelve or one o'clock and fixed my will upon the enterprise I had been considering. I carefully imagined myself going down the steps of this house, walking along the streets, arriving at S.-street, mounting to Mrs. E.'s flat and going to her drawing-room and bedroom. I then went to bed with my mind fixed upon the visit I wished to make, and soon fell asleep.

The next evening I called on Mrs. E., and found her with Mr. and Mrs. A. and some other persons just finishing dinner. I asked her if anything unusual had occurred on the previous night. She and Mrs. A. told me they had been disturbed, that the servant had heard a bell ring and had come to them in the night, etc., etc.; but I here leave the narrative to them, only mentioning that I believe it was an electric bell which the servant heard.

The next night I repeated the experiment, and when I saw them again, they told me of its success and begged me never to repeat it, as both Mrs. A. and Mrs. E. had been very much frightened,—the former by the feeling that some one was in the room, and the latter by actually seeing the upper part of my face over the top of a book which she was reading. I personally was not in any way conscious of the success of my attempt, for, so far as I remember, I did not even dream about any of the family.

I have since tried this experiment with other people, but without success. . I have never again tried it with Mrs. E. nor with her daughter.

I am afraid this is a very inconclusive narrative when taken by itself, but it is all that is absolutely within my own knowledge. When, however, it is taken in connection with what the two ladies felt and saw, it is not without interest.—Yours sincerely,

FRED. W. ROSE.

In answer to some questions from Mr. Powles, Mr. Rose wrote :

January 21st, 1896.

In reply to your note, I did not after my first experiment give notice that I intended to make another. I had tried to mesmerise Mrs. A. when she suffered from neuralgia, but without success. I feel sure I did not try her more than twice, and I had not done so for a long time before the experiments. I did not try hypnotism upon any other occupant of the house.

In answer to our further enquiries about the interval between the two experiments, Mr. Rose explained that by the phrase—"The next night I repeated the experiment"—he did not mean that the two experiments occurred on consecutive nights. He says, "I can't now remember what time elapsed between the two experiments, but I think it was some two or three weeks."

Since writing his account, Mr. Rose made two more attempts to appear to Mrs. E., who was in the south of France at the time. Mrs. E. tells us that on two nights during this period she was wakened suddenly by the feeling that some one was in the room, and was much alarmed. On the second occasion it occurred to her that Mr. Rose was perhaps trying an experiment on her. She wrote shortly after to ask him if this was the case ; but unfortunately neither of them had noted the dates, Mr. Rose feeling sure that when Mrs. E. was in a part of France that was unknown to him, he would not succeed. It is obvious, therefore, that no stress can be laid on these later experiments, and Mr. Rose tells us that a

third trial, made on February 8th, 1896, was a complete failure.

For the mode of development of the hallucination here—a luminous mist seen first and then the figure—compare *Proceedings*, Vol. X., p. 116 (No. 495·6) and other cases in Gurney's book and elsewhere.

This concludes the experimental and semi-experimental cases in our collection. Though they can hardly be regarded as a representative group, because of the number of telepathic experiments, especially series of experiments, excluded as already published in *Proceedings* or in the books mentioned, still those here put together exhibit an interesting variety of experiment, and it is much to be desired that their perusal may lead to more people trying whether they cannot develop telepathic capacity in one way or another. More experiments carefully conducted, and well recorded, are greatly needed.

CHAPTER II.

SPONTANEOUS CASES IN WHICH THE PERCIPIENT'S
IMPRESSION IS NOT EXTERNALISED.

OF cases where the percipient receives, spontaneously and apparently through telepathy, a sensation, an idea, an emotion, an impulse to action, even a vision in the mind's-eye of a scene, but where the impression does not externalise itself as a hallucination of sight, hearing or touch, there are some thirty-five in our collection, of which five are dreams.¹ As a whole the class is not a strong one as evidence of telepathy, because in it there is, as Gurney points out, a special danger that (*a*) after the coincidence is realised the impression may assume in recollection a definiteness which it did not possess in fact, and that (*b*) it may be less unusual in the percipient's experience than he supposes, owing to his forgetting cases where no coincidence was discovered. The triviality or vagueness of the impressions in many cases makes such tricks of memory more likely to occur than they are in connexion with sensory hallucinations. Nevertheless some at least of these non-hallucinatory cases are interesting and suggestive.

§ 1. *Pain Transferred.*

I will begin with cases where in a way the impression may be said to be externalised—cases of transference of a sensation of pain, resembling some experimental

¹ Dreams in which there is not an element of sensory hallucination—in which the dreamer does not seem to himself to see, hear, or feel something outside himself, are rare, at least in this collection.

cases (cf. Gurney's book, Ch. II., § 10). There are three such cases. The first (L. 1157, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 79) was sent to us by Sir Oliver Lodge, who remarks that it comes "from a trained experimenter and observer, my assistant, Mr. E. E. Robinson."

(L. 1157.)

The percipient writes :

FERNLEA, WILLOW AVENUE,
EDGBASTON, *December 16, 1905.*

On Sunday morning, December 10, 1905, I was in bed thinking of nothing in particular. Mrs. R. was dressing. I experienced an aching pain in my thumb, the kind of pain that would be produced by a hole (made by something running in).

The pain was so distinct, and the sensation of having a hole in the thumb so real, that I held up my thumb to look for it. I found there was no such hole, and the moment I realized this the pain went. Almost at the same instant Mrs. R. said to me : "I have a great difficulty in dressing, my thumb is so painful."

Two days before she had hurt her thumb by running a nail into it. She mentioned the fact to me at the time ; as she did not mention it again, the circumstance had been completely forgotten by me. I certainly had no idea of it at the time mentioned above.

E. E. ROBINSON.

It is perhaps an evidential weakness in this case that Mr. Robinson knew of Mrs. Robinson having hurt her thumb, though there seems to have been nothing to bring the circumstance to his mind at that particular moment, except her sense at the moment of pain and inconvenience, of which he had as he believes no normal knowledge. This particular source of weakness is absent in the following case so far as conscious knowledge is concerned. It is an experience on the border-line between sleeping and waking, and may have been a persistent dream sensation. (L. 1172, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 284.)

(L. 1172.)

The first account of this case was sent by the percipient, Mrs. Williams, to Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, who forwarded it to us in a letter bearing the postmark, June 25th, 1908. It was as follows :

VILLA BETHELL, GARMISCH, BAVARIA.

You will be interested in a rather curious coincidence (?) which occurred yesterday.

Arthur and I had been travelling nearly all day and were tired at night and slept soundly. The moment I woke I found myself impressed with a singularly vivid dream—not detailed, but very distinct. I thought I had torn my finger nail across, and was so certain of it that I examined it critically and was almost surprised to find it as usual. While I was looking at it Arthur said—"I tore my nail last night: got out of bed to see if I could shut out the coming light, and damaged my nail on the shutter: it is so painful."

I said—"Did you speak, or say a word about it?" He said "No, I was most anxious to make no noise, as you were so tired (one reason why I was shutting out the light) and I know I did not wake you."

I had no recollection of anything of any kind, but fancied he might have let slip a suggestive word or two, which penetrated my consciousness without waking me, but he declares he did not.

.....

In reply to a request for further details and confirmatory evidence Mrs. Williams wrote to us :

July 13th, 1908.

Last month my husband and I were travelling in Bavaria, and I was very tired on reaching Garmisch, in the Highlands.

I fell asleep directly we got into bed, and was conscious of nothing until about 7 in the morning, when I found myself earnestly examining my finger nail under the conviction that I had hurt it. I was so sure of this that

I was intensely surprised that I could see no mark of injury.

I said to my husband "I have had such an extraordinary impression that I had torn my finger nail, but nothing is wrong with it." To which he replied—"Why, I *did* hurt my nail in the night. I woke at about 4.30, and seeing signs of daylight got up to try to close the outside shutters, damaging my finger nail in the attempt." He then showed me his nail which was torn in rather a painful way.

I asked if he had called out, or spoken when he did it, for though I remembered nothing, I thought it possible a cry, or an exclamation might have penetrated to my brain through my sleep. He was certain he made no sound, being anxious not to wake me, and returned to bed perfectly satisfied that he had not done so.

E. BAUMER WILLIAMS.

Mr. Williams adds :

I confirm the above statement of facts. In trying to close the shutters I was most careful to be very quiet in order not to disturb my wife. I even abstained from looking for scissors to trim the broken nail lest I should make a noise.

THORNTON ARTHUR WILLIAMS.

36 Downshire Hill, Hampstead.

The above two cases were recorded, one a few hours and the other a few days after the experience, but the evidence for telepathy would have been stronger if the agent and percipient had been in different rooms and the percipient thus cut off from possible normal indications of the agent's sensations. In the next case (L. 1102, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 298) this condition is fulfilled, but, on the other hand, nearly a year elapsed between experience and record. The case came to us through Professor Harlow Gale of the University of Minnesota, who discussed it with the percipient and the agent. I give it briefly. Further details and additional evidence will be found in the *Journal*.

(L. 1102.)

Mrs. Castle of Minneapolis, writing in May, 1896, says :

On the first day of last July (1895) while resting, late in the afternoon, I suddenly experienced a constrictive sensation in my throat, accompanied by a numbness, which increased for some time, and finally became so distressing that I bathed and rubbed my throat several times while dressing, soon after it began—using also a mental treatment (in which I am a firm believer). I could discover no cause within myself for such a sensation, which was unlike anything I had ever experienced before. It occurred to me that it might be due to some influence outside of myself, and I thought of my husband . . . also of a friend who was stopping with me at the time.

Mr. Castle states :

On the afternoon of the first day of July, 1895, I unexpectedly had an operation performed on my throat by Dr. Bell. To allow for the passing off of the effects of the anaesthetic used in my throat he told me to remain quiet a while after the operation. But I thought I could save time by sitting in the barber's chair, and so walked about — yards to a barber shop. There I was soon seized with a terrible choking sensation which frightened the barber and myself very greatly. I remained sitting there nearly an hour before I could go on.

The two experiences appear to have coincided in time as far as could be made out, and there certainly must have been considerable points of resemblance between the two sensations ; while the percipient's was sufficiently vivid to cause her to apply remedial treatment.

These cases of transferred sensation should be compared with a perhaps more striking spontaneous case in Gurney's book, Chap. V., Case (17). And also with experiments in transference of pains.

§ 2. *Phrases Transferred.*

The cases to be next mentioned also resemble some experimental cases—phrases or words being apparently caught verbatim from the mind of a person who is in the company of the percipient, and in most of the cases in communication with him at the moment. The first is L. 1163, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 120.

(L. 1163.)

The percipient, Mr. F. W. Caulfeild, writes :

SYDMONTON, HAYWARDS HEATH, *July 7, 1905.*

In the autumn of 1903 my daughter and myself went to visit an old friend of mine, a clergyman, who had lately been appointed to a country living on the banks of the Thames, and whom I had not seen for many years. My friend met us at the station in his pony carriage, and while driving us to his house told us of an attempt he had made to organise the charities of his own and the neighbouring parishes. He said he had written to a friend in an adjoining parish on the subject, and that he, *i.e.* my friend, particularly objected to the practice, when a poor man had met with some loss, of sending him round the neighbourhood with a signed petition to collect money.

Suddenly an idea flashed on my mind which I remember appeared to me rather smart and witty, and I said : “*After all, pigs are not immortal,*” meaning of course that a poor man with a pig must expect that it may die some time, and should lay his account for that beforehand. My friend said : “Why that’s just what I said in my letter ; I said, ‘*Even pigs are not immortal.*’ ”

Judging from the very unusual character of the phrase, and from my own sensations at the time I used it, I think it must have been directly suggested to my mind.

FRANCIS W. CAULFEILD.

P.S.—I ought to add that to the best of my memory *pigs* had not been previously mentioned in our conversation ; my thoughts had naturally turned to horses or cows.

In answer to a request for corroboration, Miss Caulfeild writes :

SYDMONTON, HAYWARDS HEATH, *July 11th* [1905].

In reply to your letter of July 10, which my father has given me, it is difficult, after more than a year and a half, to recall the incident clearly.

I remember sitting beside our host who was driving, and at the same time looking back every now and then over his shoulder to speak to my father, who was sitting on the back seat.

Our host was describing what a pitch the sending round of begging petitions had come to in his parish, and my father said quickly, "After all, even pigs are mortal."

Our host laughed, and, looking back at my father, said : "How strange ; those were the very words I used in my letter to —. I said : 'Even *pigs* are mortal.' " I underline pigs, because I remember he laid stress on the word.

DOROTHY CAULFEILD.

P.S.—I remember feeling a little injured that our host did not laugh more heartily at my father's *bon mot*, which of course was explained, as he had made it himself before.

A little group of three cases is given in the *Journal*, Vol. IV., pp. 341, 342 (L. 857, L. 858, L. 859). The first is from Mrs. Barber, whose account of a similar incident in which the same child was percipient was included in Gurney's book, Chap. VI. (No. 39). She writes :

(L. 857.)

December 26, 1886.

Last week E. came to see me before I was up, and I began to speak to her about what her Christmas money should be spent in, and when I said, "I'll tell you what I've been thinking you'd like to do with your money . . ." she burst in excitedly with, "*I know ! I know* what you're going to say !" "Do you," I said, amused. "What makes you so sure ?" "*I know*," she said, "it came into my mind just now. You're going to say that I might spend it in buying toys to teach a class of Miss Headdon's !" (Precisely what I was going to say.)

N.B.—The child had keenly shared my interest in Miss Headdon's work, but as the thought with respect to the money had been an entirely new one to me, which I was taking the first opportunity of communicating to her, it was impossible that she could have heard of it in any way. . . .

CAROLINE BARBER.

The second case was received from Mrs. H. through the American Branch of the Society. Dr. Hodgson was well acquainted with Mr. and Mrs. H. She writes :

(L. 858.)

March 30th, 1889.

Mr. H. came home one afternoon [recently], and said to me, "I saw Mulliken to-day (I do not know him and his name meant nothing), and whom do you think he has seen?" I replied instantly, "Edward S. R." Mr. H. looked astonished and asked me how I knew?—if I knew Mulliken?—if I knew he had been in Brazil? I said, "No," that I did not know why I said it, the name came to my lips without conscious thought. He said it was very strange, but Mr. Mulliken had been in Brazil; had been telling him of his travels, and of meeting Mr. R.

E. S. H.

G. S. H.

The third case also came through the American Branch, and the narrator, Mrs. D., thought it had happened "about three years ago." She was talking with a friend who had passed the winter in a very lonely ranche :

(L. 859.)

I asked her if anything strange or startling had happened to her in that wild place. "Yes," she said, "I killed a big rattlesnake with twelve rattles, and you can't guess what I did it with." "A flat iron" was my instant answer, and my surprise was as great as hers when she told me I was right. The snake was near the house, and she caught up a flat-iron which was placed against the door to keep it open, and throwing it at the snake nearly cut his head off.

Mrs. D. adds on January 3rd, 1889 :

You ask if I had ever previously thought of a flat-iron as an instrument of attack upon anything obnoxious. When a young girl—at least fifty years ago—I had a great fear of burglars, and often threatened to keep a flat-iron in my room, with a string attached to it, that could be dropped upon the head of any burglar who should pass through the front entry of the house and be accommodating enough to stand still in the right spot and let me carry out my pet plan of defence. I did not consciously remember this when I answered my friend's question so promptly, but shortly after it all came back to me, and my brother reminded me of it the other day. . . .

M. C. D.

It seems probable here that the subconscious association of ideas at least facilitated the true impression, whether telepathy operated or not. But it is unlikely that there was any such association of ideas in the following case (L. 898, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 191) when a boy appeared to catch an unusual translation of a Greek word from his teacher's mind. An account of the incident first appeared in the *Boston Evening Transcript* about May, 1890, on the day after it occurred, so the correspondent stated. This account is printed in the *Journal*. In reply to Dr. Hodgson's enquiries, the teacher, Mr. Wm. Nichols, wrote on April 9th, 1891 :

(L. 898.)

A boy who was only fair in Greek, but who had a good command of English, was translating; as he came to "perieidon" [in the passage before him, viz. Herodotus VI. 108] it occurred to me that "stand by idle" would here be a good rendering of the word; I had never known of its being so rendered before. The boy hesitated for an instant at the word, and I looked at him and he at once went on, "did not stand by idle." It seemed to me a singular coincidence.

With these cases may be compared the following, in which words the agent had read a few hours before emerge in sleep (L. 1196, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 76). The

case was sent through an Associate of the Society, with names and addresses, but these are by request withheld from publication. The first account dated February 3rd, 1913, came to us from the agent's mother—Mrs. Rooke (pseudonym). This I omit. The agent writes :

(L. 1196.)

February 10, 1913.

On the afternoon of Sunday, January 19th, 1913, I was reading *Tristram of Blent*. My wife was in and out of the room a good deal, but I did not call her attention to any passage in the book. I was specially struck by the following passage, and read it over more than once, pausing for a time in my reading, but saying nothing : "If we divide humanity into those who do things and those who have to get out of the way when they are being done, Gainsborough belonged to the latter class." I remember that my wife came into the room while my attention was fixed on this passage.

Some hours later, in the evening, we were both reading, when my wife said, suddenly, that she felt very sleepy, speaking in a drowsy tone, and almost immediately she dropped off into a deep sleep. She did not wake up for about two hours. After she had been asleep for some time, she began to speak with the subdued eagerness ordinary in such cases, saying, "they are trying . . . they are trying," but apparently being unable to say more. I leaned forward (I was sitting about 10 feet away) and said, in an ordinary tone, "Yes? What are they trying to do?" She answered at once, in the tone of a person answering such a question : "*The people that have to be got out of the way of.*" She then muttered a few syllables, and was silent until she awoke, I think not less than an hour after. While she was speaking, and just before and after, she was lying perfectly still with her eyes closed and was certainly asleep.

The percipient writes :

February 10, 1913.

On Sunday, Jan. 19th, 1913, my husband and I were reading. I was quite interested in my book ; suddenly

I felt a strong desire for sleep. I had some difficulty to keep awake long enough to explain to my husband that I was obliged to go to sleep immediately—an unusual thing for me to do.

I curled up on a sofa and knew nothing more until about two hours later.

When I awoke my husband asked if I had read the book *he* was reading. (He felt sure I could not have done so, as it had only just been sent to the house.) I had not read, or even heard of it.

He then told me that he had been struck by a certain passage in his book and that in my sleep I repeated a part of it, using almost the same words.

In reply to a further question, Mrs. Rooke writes :

February 14th, 1913.

In regard to the question you ask, as to whether my son ever unconsciously reads or repeats aloud sentences that he is particularly interested in, I can answer without any hesitation that I have *never* known him to do so, and I feel quite sure that he never does. My daughters say the same, and that they could not imagine him doing so ; it would be so unlike himself.

Compare also with the above cases one (L. 1192, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 339) where Miss L. "Jones" (pseudonym), suffering from concussion of the brain, seemed during her illness to have constantly correct impressions of thoughts in her sister's mind.

§ 3. *Emotion Transferred.*

There are two cases where, not an idea, but an emotion appears to have been transferred. In the first a child of six shared an entirely baseless anxiety felt by his father. Most of us would probably be ready to admit that emotions such as fear are easily caught by children and animals, but generally, if telepathy has anything to do with this, the fact is veiled by the presence of sensory indications. The interest of the present case (L. 1186,

Journal, Vol. XV., p. 188) lies in the apparent impossibility of any sensory indications having operated.¹ The case was sent to us by Mr. F. M. J. Stratton of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, who writes in sending it :

(L. 1186.)

Nov. 20th, 1911.

Professor and Mrs. Newall, from whom I heard the story, both assured me that the written account (dated November 10) agreed entirely with the story told them when Dr. Hutchinson was visiting them on Oct. 14.

Mr. Hutchinson writes :

ST. ANNE'S, LOWESTOFT,
Nov. 10th, 1911.

DEAR MRS. NEWALL,

I forward you the few notes you wish for, but I trust you will forgive me for having been so long in sending them. I plead the usual excuse of overwork.

On the kind invitation of Professor Newall to see the Observatory at Cambridge, I decided to motor over from Lowestoft on Saturday, 14th October.

On Friday—the day previous to the trip—I had an unaccountable restless feeling that some disaster would take place on the journey. So strong did this feeling become that I decided to insure myself and car against all risk before undertaking the trip. I had some difficulty in effecting this insurance, as the time was short ; however, the agents were able to put the matter through for me, and I had my policy complete by 8.30 p.m. the same evening.

As I only had a very short time to spend in Cambridge, I decided to start from my house at 5 o'clock in the morning.

I awoke at 4.15 a.m., and immediately started to dress, but before completing my toilet I heard my son (a little fellow of six years old) crying for me in a most piteous manner.

¹ It may be observed incidentally that the case is one of *unfulfilled* premonition.

I went upstairs to see him—as he sleeps in a room by himself at the top of the house—and he immediately threw his arms round my neck, hugging me tightly and begging me not to undertake the journey. I told him not to be foolish, as I should be back with him the next day. I was unable to comfort him, so I brought him down to his mother, and I understand from her that soon after my departure he went off to sleep.

I might state here that it was a most unusual thing for the boy to wake up at that hour of the morning, nor had he been told anything very much about my intended trip.

As regards my journey to Cambridge and back, it was entirely uneventful, and I am unable to account in any way for the curious and persistent feeling I had that a calamity of some kind would take place during my absence from home.

I might point out that I have driven a motor-car for over ten years and have never taken out an insurance policy before, and would not have done so now except for the above related facts.

During the past ten years I have driven all over England and Scotland, and have never met with an accident, nor had the same peculiar apprehension before undertaking a journey.—Yours very sincerely,

DONALD HUTCHINSON.

In reply to Mr. Stratton's enquiries Mr. Hutchinson wrote to him :

Nov. 19th, 1911.

. . . With regard to your query *re* my son, I can say unhesitatingly that he knew nothing whatever regarding my forebodings, as I had been particularly careful not even to mention them to my wife. . . .

DONALD HUTCHINSON.

In the second case of what looks like transferred emotion (L. 899, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 192) the correspondence between the feelings of agent and percipient is less definite, and can indeed hardly be said to amount to more than mental disturbance in both, that of the percipient being

possibly caused by normal observation of symptoms of it in the agent. At the same time the case suggests that there may well be something more than observation through the senses in producing our impressions of each other. The record was sent to us by the percipient, Mrs. Joseph Pfirshing of Chicago. It is undated, but was printed in the *Journal* about two years after the occurrence. I will describe the case briefly.

(L. 899.)

The supposed agent, a stranger to the percipient, accompanied his family to an evening party at the percipient's house on the evening on which he (the agent) knew that his employers had discovered he was an embezzler. A week later he committed suicide. His feelings that evening can only be conjectured. Hers (the percipient's) appear to have been feelings of unaccountable distress and repulsion in connexion with the young man, and her mental distress continued more or less till the suicide. Evidentially in this case everything turns on the uniqueness of the percipient's sensations, and of this it is almost impossible to judge. She says herself in answer to enquiries :

"I have never had such a vivid sensation about a person before. . . . Its reality was so quickly carried out in the *dénouement*—perhaps that is the reason it was so strongly impressed upon me. I have all my life been strongly attracted or strongly repelled by people."

With this case may be compared an experience described by Miss Alice MacLellan of Bridgeport, Conn., U.S.A., in the *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 173. It is Number VI. of a series of experiences consisting of premonitory dreams and others, recorded apparently in 1919. In this particular case she attempted in 1915 to read by palmistry the hand of an old friend. It puzzled her, but finally she said, "It's not like you at all! Why you've got the hand of a crook." A few years later he committed suicide when he could no longer conceal his embezzlements from estates of which he was trustee, embezzle-

ments which had been going on in 1915. She asks, "Did I see into his mind, or did I read it in his hand?"

§ 4. *Idea from Distant Agent.*

In the cases so far dealt with in this chapter, the agent and percipient have generally been together. In the remaining cases they were separated. In the first two, a definite thought in the agent's mind is reflected in the percipient's and connected with the distant agent. We received the first (L. 831, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 179) from the Rev. A. T. Fryer, who wrote on April 19th, 1889 :

(L. 831.)

I know the two persons who have written the enclosed. I have seen the envelopes and they bear the dates, February 13th and February 15th, 1889, posted January 31st and February 4th respectively, as shown by post marks. I can vouch for the truth-telling capacities of the percipient and her mother.

E. M.'s NARRATIVE.

Very early on Sunday morning, February 3rd, when half asleep, half awake, I became vaguely conscious that a gentleman I know living in America was trying to influence me in some way. This feeling at once thoroughly woke me up, and I seemed to know that Mr. — was thinking of me at that time, and that he was sending me a proposal.

Various circumstances made this most unlikely, one being the fact that I believed him either to be engaged, or on the point of being engaged to an American lady. So I tried to go to sleep again, and did all I could not to think of the impression I had received. But it was no use, a stronger will than mine kept forcing my thoughts to America, and I felt certain a letter was coming.

For 13 days and nights this conviction seemed ever present with me—try as I would not to dwell upon it.

Not even receiving on the 13th a letter from this very gentleman, telling me that as I had refused to marry him

the previous autumn he had at last fully made up his mind to propose to an American girl, and to be married very shortly—altered my conviction.

On February 15th I received the letter of proposal, saying that at the last moment he could not propose to the American, and would ask me once more. The letter was written late on Saturday evening, February 2nd (allowing for difference in time between America and England at the very time I had the impression that a letter was being written). It was posted on the 4th.

My mother remembers my telling her of my impression before I received the letter.

STATEMENT FROM E. M.'s MOTHER.

I remember "E. M." showing me a letter on February 13th from a friend of hers (who is abroad), stating that he was likely to propose marriage to a young lady. "E. M." then told me that previously, in the night of February 3rd, whilst lying half asleep, she had a strong impression that he was going to propose to her, though from what he had before written this seemed most unlikely, but a letter received two days later proved that her impression was right.

ANSWERS FROM E. M. TO MR. FRYER'S QUESTIONS.

1. Corroborative statement?—I enclose my mother's. I mentioned my presentiment to no one else except to you. I told my mother on February 13th, when I received the first letter (which I showed her), that I had a presentiment that a letter of proposal was on its way to me from Mr. —.

2. May I see the two envelopes?—Envelopes enclosed. The first letter was written January 31st, the second was dated February 2nd, 11 p.m.

3. Have you ever had any similar experience?—Yes, on three occasions, but I cannot get them corroborated, as my brother and the friends concerned object to answering questions on the subject. The first time was during August, 1879. I was away from home, and was just recovering from an illness. I awoke one night feeling

certain that my only brother was in a railway accident. I immediately lighted a candle and looked at my watch—eight minutes to 12—as I did so I felt that he was unhurt, and that all danger was over. The next day my brother unexpectedly arrived, and I found that he had been in a slight railway accident the night before. The accident took place a few minutes before midnight, as he also had looked at his watch. The second time, February 27th, 1885. A strong conviction that something (I knew not what) utterly unexpected would arise on or before May 21st that would cause unhappiness to two people and entirely alter the course of their lives. I mentioned this a day or two after to the person chiefly concerned, in the hope that whatever it was it might be averted. This person only laughed at it, and as late as May 20th declared it could not come true—it was pure imagination on my part. It came true on the 21st. The third time, September, 1885, that a great friend of mine, of whom I had not heard for some time, was staying in a certain place in lodgings, and was at the time very unhappy and worried. This also proved to be true.

4. Can you say how long before February 3rd you had heard from or of him [the gentleman in America]?—No one had mentioned his name to me for weeks, but I had had a few lines from him during January.

5. Had you talked about him or read any letters from or about him on or about the 1st or 2nd of February, 1889?—No.

6. Were you in ordinary health?—Yes. I always have more or less constant headache, and my headaches had been very severe just before—but were better at the time.

7. What initials?—E. M. will do.

In answer to an inquiry whether she had ever had hallucinations or impressions which were *not* veridical, "E. M." writes :

I have never had any strong impression, hallucination, or dream that has *not* come true—beyond one dream that

repeats itself about every year at uncertain intervals. I have had it five or six times.

I wake up dreaming that a man with red hair and a red beard is leaning over my bed with a knife in his hand. Sometimes he has hold of my shoulder. For some minutes after I am awake I still seem to see and feel him, his hot breath coming on my face. I try and knock his arm on one side, and it goes through him. After about two minutes he gradually fades away. It is always the same face, and I cannot—since I first had the dream about six years ago—conquer my horror of red-headed men, though I have never seen any man like the man I see; I have tried moving my bed to another part of the room, but the dream still comes.

The other case (L. 1213, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 56) of a thought or wish apparently transferred from a distant agent comes to us through Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, whose sister was the percipient. Miss Dickinson writes :

(L. 1213.)

11 EDWARDES SQUARE, W. 8.

[April 3, 1917.]¹

On Thursday, March 29th, 1917, I was upstairs at 8.30 a.m., and the front-door bell rang. I said to myself that it must be my cousin, Harry Dickinson, come to tell me his mother was ill. When the maid came up a few minutes later, I asked her what the ring at the bell was. She replied that it was a telegram for Mr. G. I said to her, "I thought it was Mr. Harry Dickinson come to tell me his mother was ill." I went out at 8.45 for the rest of the morning, returning about 12.30. When I came in, the maid said to me, "Mr. Harry Dickinson has been to ask you to go and see his mother, who is ill." I said "What time did he come?" E. F. replied, "About 11 o'clock."

I had not been thinking of my aunt, nor do I often

¹ In reply to a question as to the date of this account, Miss Dickinson says, "I wrote out my account a few days after [the incident] happened, but I do not remember the exact date. I should think April 3rd."

see her, but March or April, 1916, my cousin came round about 8.30 a.m. to ask me the same thing.

JANET LOWES DICKINSON.

We have also obtained the following statement from Miss Dickinson's maid :

11 EDWARDES SQUARE, W. 8 [*April 14, 1917*].

On Thursday, March 29th, 1917, I went upstairs soon after 8.30 a.m. and Miss Janet asked me what the ring at the bell was. I said it was a telegram for Mr. G. She said, "I thought it was Mr. Harry Dickinson come to tell me his mother was ill." Miss Janet went out soon after, and when she came in about 12.30, I said, "Mr. Harry Dickinson came this morning to ask you to go and see his mother, who is ill." Miss Janet said, "What time did he come?" and I said, "About 11 o'clock."

ETHEL FAWKES.

Miss Dickinson has also sent us the following letter from Mr. Harry Dickinson, who appears to have been the agent in the case :

222 GOLDHAWK ROAD, SHEPHERD'S BUSH,
LONDON, W., *April 8, 1917.*

With reference to our conversation of to-day's date, when you told me that you had a strong impression of my mother's illness on the morning of 29th ult., I can say that some time between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. on that day I was in great anxiety of mind and was considering calling round and asking you to sit with her. As you will remember I called round the same morning at about 11 a.m. with that intention and found that you had gone out. My anxiety (apart from her illness) was based on the fact that I was obliged to finish certain work at once, and that I could not leave her alone all day in the condition she was in at the time. My mother also wished me to call for you.

HARRY DICKINSON.

Miss Dickinson mentions in her original statement that about a year before her cousin had come to her early in the morning to ask her to go to his mother who was ill, and we, therefore, asked whether Mr. H. Dickinson had done this on more than

one previous occasion, and whether, on March 29, 1917, Miss Dickinson had any reason to think that her aunt was ill. Miss Dickinson replied to these questions as follows :

April 23 [1917].

1. I did not know my aunt was ill; she was only taken ill the night before.

2. My cousin had not sent for me since March or April, 1916.

JANET L. DICKINSON.

It, therefore, appears that (a) on the morning of March 29, 1917, Miss Dickinson had no special reason for expecting that Mr. H. Dickinson would send for her to sit with his mother; (b) at about the time, 8.30 a.m., when she had the impression that he had come, he was thinking of coming and actually came a few hours later.

§ 5. *Motor Impulse.*

There are in our collection three cases in which the percipient receives a motor impulse—an impulse to do something. Unfortunately in the first two of these the interval between event and record is just at our limit of five years, though there is some contemporary evidence in the second case.

In the first of the three cases (L. 893, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 172) the percipient writes :

(L. 893.)

Friday, March 13th [1891].

I am at present an undergraduate of Trinity College, Cambridge. At the time the incident occurred I was a Rugby boy. I was at home for the holidays during the summer of 1886. I think the month was August. I was employed in reading for an Indian prize given at school; consequently, on the occasion of a tennis party given at our house, the Rectory of Great Rollright, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire, I did not go out with the rest when they went down to our tennis court, which is about 200 yards off, but stayed inside the house reading *Holmes' Indian Mutiny*. My mother had gone out with the rest to the

tennis ground. Feeling it cold, she sent my youngest brother, H., for her white shawl. I met him halfway between the tennis ground and the house carrying the aforesaid shawl [myself]. The reasons for this were: at the time that my mother asked my brother to get her the shawl, I felt an impression that I must do something. This gradually increased in intensity till I knew that my mother wanted a shawl; then, as if by another stage of completer intuition, I knew it was a white shawl, and I knew that I had to go to the drawing-room to fetch it (though I did not previously know it was there). So I went and fetched it and brought it to my mother, as I felt obliged to do. She and my brother were, of course, greatly surprised, and I remember asking her whether she had thought of me in connection with the shawl, or wished me in any way especially to fetch it. She responded in the negative, which makes the matter more curious. The call was distinct and imperative, and altogether unlike anything else I have ever experienced. I have never seen phantasmagoria, &c., or had any other strange experiences of the sort before or since.

VERNON H. RENDALL.

I corroborate all the details in the incident here related.

ELLEN H. RENDALL.

Great Rollright Rectory, Chipping Norton.

The second case (L. 1131, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 80) was sent to Mr. N. W. Thomas by a friend of his, Mr. A. B. Gough, who collected the evidence for it. We are requested not to publish the names of the persons concerned.

(L. 1131.)

The account is contained in a letter written in German by Frau U., of which the following is a translation:

February 21st, 1902.

On the evening of February 25th, 1897, I was sitting alone, as I almost invariably did, and reading, when I

suddenly thought of the Beethoven Trio Op. 1 No. 1¹ so vividly that I got up to look for the music, which I had not touched for nearly 20 years. It was just as if I could hear the 'cello and violin parts, and the bowing and expression seemed to be that of two gentlemen who had played with me often in C—— so many years before. One of them, Kammermusiker L——, first 'cellist of the Residence Theatre in C——, had been my eldest son's master, but had been called to H—— in 1878. The other, who was employed by my husband at that time as clerk of the works, had subsequently quitted C—— also, and removed in the middle of the nineties to H——. I had often seen him since he left C——, and had also played duets with him, but never again in a trio.

I got out the piano part and began to play;—I must here admit that I had played with Z—— and L—— principally the Trio in B sharp, Op. 97, and the one in C flat, Op. 1 No. 3, and was myself surprised that this Op. 1 No. 1, which we had hardly ever played, was ringing in my ears. At any rate I heard with my mental ear this melody so exactly that I played the piece right through to the end.

About 10 o'clock the bell rang and my housemate, the daughter of Lieutenant-Col. G——, who lived over me, came in. She apologised for her late visit and assured me that she could not sleep until she had found out what I had been playing. I supplied the information, and she remarked, "Well, what brought that into your head?" "I don't know, I haven't opened the book for twenty years, but before I began I heard Z—— and L—— playing and I felt I must recall the full harmony."

The next day but one the enclosed card came; it had been written, as we established by subsequent correspondence, on the same evening and at the same hour, and as the post-mark shows, delivered (in K——) the following [should be "the next but one"] morning.

(Signed) FRAU M—— U——.

¹ This account does not strictly agree with Mr. Z——'s account of Frau U——'s contemporary postcard, see below p. 113.

The following is a translation of the postcard:

H—, 25 Febr. 97.

After playing Beethoven Op. 1 No. 1 we send you hearty greetings in remembrance of happy hours spent together in the past.
Z—, R— L—.

The postcard bears the post-marks—"H . . . 26/2/97. 8-9 V." ("V." = A.M.) and "K. . . 26/2/97 10-11." The mark after "10-11" is very indistinct, resembling both V. and N.; but apparently it must be "N." (=P.M.), since it takes at least six or seven hours for a letter to go from H. to K. The postcard would then not have been delivered in K. before the following morning.

Mr. Gough obtained the following corroborative statement from Fräulein G.:

On Feb. 25th, 1897, I heard some one playing the piano at Frau U—'s below us between 9 and 10. I could not remember what it was, though I knew the music; so I went down and asked. I learnt that Frau U— had been playing Beethoven Op. 1 No. 1, a piece which she had not played for many years. U— G—.

Miss G. writes as follows in answer to further questions:

I noticed that Frau U— was playing only *one* part. She explained to me that she was playing it because she felt she must (der Gedanke an das Stück sie dazu trieb). I saw the postcard after it arrived. The date was, as I satisfied myself, the same as that on which Frau U— had played the piece. U— G—.

Mr. Gough in sending the case, writes as follows to Mr. Thomas:

February 23rd, 1902.

I enclose Frau U—'s account of her experience, together with the postcard and a short note by Frl. G—, written without any previous consultation with Frau U—. The latter however had described the occurrence to me last Sunday in the presence of Frl. G—, and mentioned

the date, which can therefore hardly be regarded as corroborated by the latter. . . .

Frau U—— is writing, or has written, to Mr. Z—— to ask him to write down his version, but she does not think he will remember much, as he is very forgetful. . . . She has related the experience twice to me, without any divergence from the written account. She added that as she only played her part in the trio, the peculiar effect attracted the curiosity of Frl. G—— (at least I think so). . . . Whether the statement that the two men played the piece at exactly the same time can be confirmed, I don't know. Frau U—— says it was their habit to play music after a late dinner. One might guess that this was the case when the postcard was written. As you will observe, it was not posted till the next morning. It passed through the K—— P.O. on the evening of the 26th and was delivered at the house the next morning. . . . Frau U—— had only made the acquaintance of Frl. G—— shortly before the event, and they were not on such intimate terms as they are now.

The following is a translation of a letter from Mr. Z. to Mr. Thomas :

27/4/1902.

After the event in question on Feb. 25, 1897, Frau U—— wrote me a postcard containing the following words amongst others : "I must mention also the remarkable coincidence ; I had not played for months, but on the evening of the 25th I had such an unconquerable desire to play that I executed first a piece of Schumann (from the Kreisleriana) and then, without knowing why I did so, the first and second movements of the Trio Op. 1."

We played immediately after dinner, about 9 in the evening. The performances may therefore have been simultaneous. The Kreisleriana was a souvenir of our former musical companionship. I gave the book to Frau U—— and she frequently played me pieces from it. I had spoken several times to Mr. L—— on the evening in question (before we began) about the Trio-evenings in

C——. It seems possible therefore that a telepathic influence was at work.

Z——.

In answer to further questions, Mr. Z. writes :

May 9th, 1902.

With the exception of this single evening I have only met Herr L—— in the street (*i.e.* after leaving C——); on such occasions he occasionally asked after the U—— family. With the exception of the postcard in question we never sent a common greeting to Frau U——.

Mr. L. was also asked to confirm the account, but no answer to this request was received.

Mr. Gough writes further as follows :

March 7th, 1902.

Re Frau U—— : The first time she told me the story was one day this semester, before Xmas, probably in December. She believes she had been reading, but she has quite forgotten what. She is certain she had not been playing the piano. She hardly ever plays. She has no knowledge of having been thinking of the men. The date was not in any way associated with them.

She knew that Z—— was in H——, and she believes she had sent him greetings on his birthday, the 20th of January, but she had not received or expected a reply. It is her habit to exchange birthday greetings with certain friends to whom she writes on no other occasions. She always sends Z—— a card on his birthday, and he sends one on hers (in November), but they do not correspond except for this. There was no communication between them between his birthday and the occurrence. She had no idea that the two men played together, nor indeed that they had met in H——, although she had heard a good while before that L—— had obtained a post there. She did not know, however, whether he was still there. She had no communications with him.

There was certainly no piano or other instrument in the house, or in either of the adjoining houses that

could have been heard on the evening in question. Frau U—— told me who her neighbours above, below, right and left were, and assures me that they none of them played music. She is quite positive about this.

She has never been to a concert at K——.

The trio used to play some other pieces very often, but this piece was only played about twice.

Unfortunately I have not seen Frl. G—— again, but Frau U—— tells me she (Frl. G——) knew the date (as I supposed) from hearing it talked about when I was there in February, when the post-card was produced. Frau U—— also says she showed her the post-card when it came; also that Frl. G—— did notice it was only one part that was being played. Frl. G—— is said (by Frau U——) to have a remarkable memory for tunes and sounds.

May 9th, 1902.

Z—— had given her several books of music, including B.'s Sonatas, but not his trios.

She had played Schumann's *Kreisleriana* "x-mal" to Z——. He had given her a copy in 1875. Shown me, with dedication.

Frau U—— has found in an old memorandum book a note to effect that she wrote to Z—— on March 1st, 1897, [which was] shown me.

The third case of the group (L. 886, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 137) also describes the playing of a particular piece of music in response to an unusual impulse. I do not quote it in full, as I understand it was communicated to us not for publication. It is a death coincidence. The piece was a favourite of a friend of the percipient's who had made her promise that if possible she would play it to her on her death-bed. The percipient did not often play it, and on the evening when, as she says, "Suddenly and unconsciously to myself I found myself playing" it, and consequently thinking of her friend, she was not even aware that the friend, who died that evening, was ill. We do not know that the dying agent

had the music or the percipient in mind, but for the latter the association of the music with the idea of the agent's death was close. The case was sent to Mr. Myers, who knew the percipient, about eight months after the occurrence.

§ 6. *Impressions of Danger.*

The two experiences to be next described are of a vaguer kind—impressions of calamity or impending danger not connected by the percipient at the time with any particular agent. In the first (L. 990, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 120) the percipient describes an “indefinable dread amounting to positive terror” on the day on which, as it proved, her brother was taken seriously ill as the result of an accident. Unfortunately the narrative, though the record was made only a few months after the experience, is not very complete, and does not tell us when the accident occurred and whether the impression began before it and was thus premonitory or not.

The second case (L. 1142, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 323) describing a feeling of impending danger, which was possibly the result of telepathy from a dog, and certainly led to the discovery of its perilous condition, is of interest as bearing on the question whether animals can be in telepathic communication with men.¹

(L. 1142.)

The case was sent to us by Mr. J. F. Young, of New Road, Llanelly, South Wales.

NEW ROAD, LLANELLY, Nov. 13th, 1904.

I own a rough terrier, about 5 years old, which I have brought up from a pup. I have always been a great lover of animals, dogs especially. This dog returns my affection so much that I never go anywhere, not even leave the room, but he must follow me. He is death

¹ Four other possible cases of animal agency will be found in this chapter and the next. A case of possible animal percipency is L. 1156, p. 340.

on rats, and the scullery being visited occasionally by these rodents, I have a comfortable bed for Fido to sleep on. In this room there is a fire-place with an oven suitable for baking, and a boiler for washing, with a flue running back into the chimney (as sketch) [not reproduced here]. It was my custom to take him to his bed the last thing before retiring for the night. I had undressed and was about getting into bed, when an unaccountable feeling came over me of impending danger. I could think of nothing possible but *Fire*, and the impression was so strong that I yielded to it and actually dressed again, and went downstairs and examined each room to satisfy myself that all was right. When I got to the scullery I missed Fido, and thinking he had slipped by me unobserved to go upstairs, I immediately began to call him, but getting no response, I called to my sister-in-law to know if she had heard him, and getting an answer in the negative, I began to feel excited, and rushed back to the scullery again, and called repeatedly, but not a sound could be heard. What to do I did not know. It then occurred to me that if anything will get him to respond it will be the sentence, "Come for a walk, Fido," which always gave him delight. As soon as I had repeated this sentence, I heard a faint cry, muffled as if distant; calling again, the cry of a dog in distress came plainly. I eventually traced it to the flue [at a point marked in the sketch], where the flue uniting the boiler with chimney runs. For the moment I could not think how I could get him out; moments were precious, life was in danger. I took a pickaxe and soon tore down a portion of the wall, when with some difficulty I drew him out half-dead, panting, vomiting, tongue and body black with soot; my pet would soon have been dead, and as the boiler is only used occasionally, I should never have known what had become of him. Hearing the noise my sister-in-law came to the scene. We found a rat-hole in the fireplace which led to the flue. Fido had evidently chased the rat into the flue and could not turn or retreat. . . . This occurred a few months ago and was reported at the time in our local paper, but I never

thought of sending it to you until I read the Rider Haggard story. (See below, p. 219.)

J. F. YOUNG.

Mr. Young's sister-in-law writes :

The above is a correct account of the incident.

E. BENNETT.

Mr. Young tells us that his sister-in-law was the only person besides himself in the house at the time and therefore the only other possible witness. In reply to questions as to the possibility of his having heard any sounds made by the dog before he went downstairs, he writes :

November 19th, 1904.

. . . *Re Dog.* As suggested by you I will give you a few more particulars relating to this. I think you will at once see the utter impossibility of any sounds reaching me, unless they had been *very* loud, and even then my sister-in-law, who sleeps nearer the dog than I do, would have noticed it. In fact she enquired as I was crossing the landing to go down, where I was going ; when I replied that "I felt as if something was going to happen, and feared it might be fire." I may here remark that as I passed from room to room, I began to accuse myself for being so silly as to imagine any danger. However, I went on looking for something, not having the slightest idea of what to expect. From that time, until I read Rider Haggard's dream, I put it down to an intelligence outside myself that had prompted me to go down. The telepathic theory now takes its place, especially taking into consideration the devotion of the dog, for, if possible, he will not allow me out of his sight, and in my absence is quite a different dog. . . .

In reply to query (1), Yes. I took him, as I always do, to his bed the *last thing* [before going] the round of the rooms and doors to see that all is safe. I (2) also enclose a sketch, in section, which will give you an idea as to our positions. (3) I never heard any sounds, and neither could I get any after repeated whistling and calling, until I called him *to go for a walk*, and that

was so faint I could not at first localise it. You will observe the position of the dog was actually the furthest [from me] that could be in the house. . . .

J. F. YOUNG.

In this letter and a later one, Mr. Young enclosed rough plans of his house, showing his bedroom at the front, and on the opposite side of the house from the scullery, which is at the back. The bedroom is on the first floor and the scullery in the basement, the ground floor intervening between them. There were also three doors, all shut and locked, between the interiors of the two rooms, namely, the doors of the rooms themselves and a third door at the top of the lowest flight of stairs leading down to the basement. Under these circumstances, it is very difficult to suppose that Mr. Young could have heard any sounds from the dog imprisoned in the flue.

We may take next a case where misfortune was averted by acting on the impression which was quite definite, but where we cannot point with any certainty to a particular agent (P. 285, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 29). The percipient had, however, been in the company of several men who may have anticipated danger.

(P. 285.)

The account was sent to Sir Oliver Lodge by Mr. John A. A. Williams, of Aberglaslyn Hall, Beddgelert, North Wales, in a letter dated October 31st, 1912 :

I have often thought of writing to tell you the following facts. The story got into some of the papers, and I saw an account of it in the *Liverpool Courier* which was not quite correct. Until last year I was the principal proprietor of one of the largest slate quarries in ——. I used to go up there occasionally to look round with the Manager, who had the charge of them. On Nov. 25th, 1910, I went up with my brother, and we both went round with the Manager. On our return in the motor, my brother was telling me about a "shoot" he had been to, and I was listening attentively, as it was about

a mutual friend. In the middle of his telling me, I had a sort of message, and seemed to see a certain portion of the quarry and the men in great danger. I interrupted my brother and said, "Excuse me interrupting you, but I have had the most extraordinary message, that those eight men we saw working are in danger." He said, "But what do you know about it? The men have worked in the quarry for many years, and they would know if it were dangerous; also the Manager and sub-agents have been there many years and know the ground well." I said, "I don't care. I shall stop at — Post Office (after dropping my brother) and will wire to the Manager to stop them working." My brother said, "He will think you have gone perfectly mad," and that I had never interfered with the working, etc., etc.; however, I *did* stop and I sent the wire. The Manager went to the eight (or ten) men and said to the men, "It is an extraordinary thing, I have received a wire, etc., from Mr. Williams. I cannot understand it, but you must stop working at once," and the men were equally surprised and took up their tools and left the ground. About half an hour to three-quarters of an hour [later], the whole of that ground fell to the bottom of the quarry, about 120 yards, and all the *débris* from above fell on top; nothing could have saved them—no warning. In the morning I had several telegrams, one from the agent, saying, "good thing you sent wire, as all the ground gave way shortly after the men left," and I had others to the same effect. When I received them I lay on the sofa for a long time in a highly nervous state, quite overcome. When I went up to the quarry the next day to see the ground, one of the men came to me on behalf of the others, to thank me for saving their lives.

JOHN A. A. WILLIAMS.

Through the efforts of Mr. J. Arthur Hill, who kindly undertook to collect the evidence for this case, the original letters written to Mr. Williams next day by his brother, and by the agent and manager of the quarry, were put into our hands, and we give below copies of them:

(1) *From the Agent.*

Nov. 26, 1910.

I cannot tell you how glad I am that you sent that telegram yesterday to the Manager, because all that ground came down in about an hour after the men cleared away.

I went up to-day by the 12.40 train and saw a considerable change there. For a length of about 20 yards the ground where we and the men stood had all slipped away, so that it is now not possible to walk the whole length of that side as we did yesterday. We had to descend from close to the eating shed. Part of the wall has also gone, exposing the piles: still there is no leakage of water from the lake. The men are clearing right well from both ends. We can only hope that the water will keep away for a little while, until a temporary bit of dam can be made there. Somehow I feel much calmer to-day, seeing how near we were to a great disaster—the killing of 7 to 10 men. We must still hope for the best.

[P.S.]—I have dropped further note to Mr. D. saying that a further lot fell last night.

(2) *From the Manager.*

Nov. 26, 1910.

I was very glad to have your wire last night, as I was so anxious about the safety of the men. They also were all very glad to hear your order not to work in the dark. And, no doubt, it was very fortunate that you did wire, because about an hour later the whole of the place where they were working upon went down.

I wired you this morning to inform you that [a] great [deal] more of the rubbish as well as a part of the piles and a part of the big wall went down last night; fortunately the water still keeps back, there are a few very small streams running down the clay side, it is impossible to say whether these come from the actual lake or not, we are setting small troughs to carry it over the clay. . . .

(3) *From Mr. Williams's brother.*

Monday [Nov. 28, 1910].

This morning I drove to the quarry. The position now seems to me to be much more favourable than it was on Saturday. There are no cracks known to exist in the face of the rocks. The gravel will keep dropping until a natural face is formed. I certainly feel to-night that, barring a big flood in the next fortnight, water will not flood the quarry. G—— and all the men are doing their very best to clear down to the virgin soil in the lowest water level part, and I am sure if you could motor up again they would all be very glad to see you, and I am sure your mind would be as much relieved as mine is this evening. It is well you sent that wire. I forgot to ask how much warning that part gave—probably not much.

In reply to a question from Mr. Hill as to whether there was any apparent danger of such an accident happening, Mr. Williams wrote :

Nov. 3, 1912.

There is always danger [in] working in those quarries where the sides are perpendicular for over 100 yards. There were no indications of any unusual danger, as my brother could bear me out. I both spoke to the agent that day and also to the sub-agent, that on no account was any risk to be run, if the place showed any indications of danger, and they both said they would not run the risk, neither would the men. . . . The Manager and men knew the ground well and they would not run any risk (unnecessary).

You will notice my Manager says in his letter, "I was very glad to have your wire, as I was anxious about the safety of the men." Why did he say that in his letter when he told us both that it was quite safe and when I told him not to run any risk ? . . .

The discrepancy pointed out by Mr. Williams is perhaps to be explained by supposing that the Manager, after the catastrophe, blamed himself for not foreseeing it and imagined

that he had felt an anxiety beforehand, for which there seems to have been no adequate ground. In situations of this kind, there may often be subconscious anxiety in the minds of the persons concerned. It is conceivable that some such feeling in the Manager impressed Mr. Williams telepathically, and caused him to send the telegram. It is also conceivable that Mr. Williams subconsciously noticed some indications of danger when he visited the quarry, and that this gave rise later to his sudden impulse to send the telegram.

In the letter just quoted, Mr. Williams gives two rough drawings of a section through the quarry, showing the position of the ground before and after the accident. The height of the gallery on which the men were working is given as 340 feet from the bottom of the quarry.

With a view to obtaining further evidence as to whether there was any reasonable ground for expecting an accident, Mr. Williams, who has taken a great deal of trouble to provide us with all the information possible, wrote to his brother to ask for his present recollections of the incident, and sent us his reply, which seems to show that at least neither of the brothers was at all anxious about the condition of the quarry.

The letter is as follows:

Dec. 31, 1912.

My recollection of what occurred on Nov. 24th, 1910, when you and I were returning from the quarry in a motor is that when passing — about nine miles from the quarry, and I was telling you about a shoot that I had been to, you suddenly interrupted me and said something to the following effect: "Whilst you were talking I had a curious sort of message that those men are in danger, and that I shall send a wire to stop them working when I get to —," and you went to the Post Office there and sent the telegram to G—— instructing him to immediately stop the men.

The date Nov. 24, 1910, here given, is obviously a slip, as the contemporary letters show that it was on Nov. 25, 1910, that the accident occurred.

§ 7. *Vague but insistent thought of Agent.*

In the last-mentioned three cases it has been the idea of the event and not that of the agent that has been apparently transferred, however vaguely. In the next two, what reaches the percipient is nothing but the idea of the agent. The first of the two (L. 972, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 212)—if not a mere coincidence, which is perhaps the most probable hypothesis—has the interest of a sort of semi-reciprocity about it, the proximity, unknown to either, of agent and percipient being the only cause suggested for the percipient's thought of the agent, and this thought leading possibly to the agent's thinking of the percipient some hours later.

(L. 972.)

The account comes from Mrs. Walker, 319, Hagley-road, Edgbaston, Birmingham. It was enclosed in a letter dated November 15th, 1893, but Mrs. Walker tells us that it was written some time earlier.

On September 10th, 1892, I was walking by myself along a road near our home, hastening to join my husband, to look over a new house which we thought might suit us. My mind was completely absorbed in mental measurements and arrangement of rooms—weighing questions of rent, expenses, and sleeping accommodation, etc., etc., so that I scarcely noticed anything by the way. Suddenly the whole train of thought vanished from my mind, and was replaced by a mental picture of a little boy about 12, whom formerly I used occasionally to notice about in our parish at various meetings, but whom I [had] not seen for more than a year, and certainly (as far as I could remember) had never thought of, or inquired about, since. I did not know him well, but had merely spoken to him once or twice, as one amongst hundreds of our school children, though he had so far impressed me that I should have described him as a rather original little fellow, and better educated than most.

However, busy and preoccupied as I was that morning Joey Fisher suddenly, *without the slightest cause* or outside

suggestion, obtruded himself upon my mind, so that I began to wonder what had become of the lad, as I had neither seen nor heard anything of him for about a year. His face seemed to rise up before me, and the thought of him occupied my mind for a minute or two. I was then passing along a road separated by a high hedge from the Rotton Park Reservoir, and can remember the very place where I began to think of the boy, and where, on coming in sight of the turn in the road that led to the new house, my thoughts seemed to jump back to the absorbing subject of interest with regard to the decision we had to make at once about the house. I thought no more about it until, early in the evening, a parcel containing a large pike was brought in to me *from Joey Fisher*. I was still more surprised when, coming back from a parish meeting later the same evening, I happened to meet the boy in the street, and learned that he had caught the pike himself that day in our Reservoir, and had been standing fishing down below the road *at the exact time I had passed* (but quite out of sight of the road). I asked, "What made him think of sending it to me?" He replied, "I don't know; it seemed to come into my mind all at once, 'I wonder if Mrs. Walker would like this fish?' So I asked at home if I might take it you, and went up with it in the evening."

Afterwards I thought it, at any rate, such a curious coincidence that I asked the boy to write it down, which he did, and I enclose his short account.

I may add that I had never imagined in any way either that he could fish or would be likely to be at the Reservoir. In fact, the boy had scarcely ever entered into my consciousness, until he suddenly that morning seemed to spring up before my mental vision, displacing an absorbing train of thought, *just when, unknown to each other, we were very near together.*

JESSIE E. WALKER.

P.S.—You will notice, the boy did not, apparently, think of sending the fish to me until he returned to the same spot in the *afternoon*; so, although *he* had come into *my* mind when passing (unseen) in the morning, it was not for some hours later that *I* seem to have occurred to *him*.

The account enclosed by Mrs. Walker is as follows :

I was fishing for pike at the Reservoir, Edgbaston, on Saturday, September 10th. I caught one in the morning, and before going home to dinner I threw in several lines, and when I returned in the afternoon I stood for a time on the feeder bridge, watching the smaller fish, when I noticed an unusual flutter in the water just about the spot where in the morning I had put in the lines ; I got my drag and was very surprised to find I had caught another pike. I was very pleased and wondered what I should do with it, and suddenly I thought, how would Mrs. Walker like it. When I got home my sister made it into a parcel and I took it to Mrs. Walker in the evening ; the same night I happened to meet Mrs. Walker in the Crescent ; she said she was very pleased with it and thanked me [and said] how singular it was that at the very time I was thinking what to do with the pike, she was the other side of the Reservoir thinking of me, and wondering where I was, as she had not seen me for so long.

Berea, Gillot-road.

J. A. FISHER.

March 18th, 1893.

In the second case (L. 1199, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 203) the tragical nature of the agent's or agents' experience presents a strong contrast to the triviality of the last, but does not help to explain why the impression should have come to the particular percipient on that day. The case was sent to us by the late Mr. F. E. Kitchener of Stone, Staffordshire.

(L. 1199.)

The names and addresses of all the persons concerned have been communicated to us, but by request pseudonyms or initials are here substituted. The percipient, Mr. "Parker," who is a clergyman, describes his experience as follows in a letter, a copy of which was received by Mrs. Sidgwick from Mr. Kitchener on December 16th, 1913 :

On Sunday evening, Dec. 7th, 1913, I explained to my niece and companion, M. W., that thoughts of two friends

in whose house I had lived for 12 months, 44 years ago, for the purposes of completing my education after leaving school, had occupied my mind during the day in a most unaccountable manner. I had not seen Mr. and Mrs. C. for 28 years, and had long since ceased to correspond with them. The last time I had heard of them they were living in retirement at D——. I added that I was so much impressed by the frequent recurrence of these thoughts that, had there been any tendency to superstition about me, I should probably have expected to hear that something had happened to one or both of them. My niece and I smiled at the very suggestion!

On the following Friday, to my surprise, I received a copy of the D—— *Daily Telegraph* in which was the account of the tragic death of Mrs. C. from burning, which occurred early in the morning of Sunday, Dec. 7th. Her nightdress caught fire as she was lighting a candle to ascertain the time by her watch. The doctor at the inquest reported that death had ensued very shortly after the accident, and was mainly due to shock.

Mr. and Mrs. C. were 86 years of age.

Miss W. corroborates Mr. Parker's statement as follows in a letter received by Mr. Kitchener on January 5th, 1914:

On Sunday, Dec. 7th, [1913], at lunch time, my uncle spoke to me about a Mr. and Mrs. C., saying he had been thinking all the morning about them. I had never heard him mention them before, and did not know of their existence.

Then again at supper time he spoke of them and said that, if he had been of at all a superstitious nature, he supposed he should have expected to hear something about them within the next few days.

On the following Friday he received a cutting from a D—— newspaper with an account of Mrs. C.'s accident and death.

Before telling me that he had received the paper, he asked me on which day it was that he had spoken to me about Mr. and Mrs. C. This he did to make sure that it was the day of the accident. [Signed] M. W.

Mr. Parker sent us the cutting from the D—— *Daily Telegraph* above referred to. It is dated Monday, December 8, 1913, and describes the death as having occurred soon after 6 a.m.

Mr. Kitchener writes :—

To the facts as stated by Mr. [Parker] I may add the following :

(1) Mr. [Parker] is a man I have known for years, accurate and businesslike. He has hitherto had no sympathy with any investigation of such cases, as I know from his reception of one or two personal experiences of my own communicated by me to him.

(2) I never heard him mention Mr. and Mrs. C., though he has told me many details of his boyhood and young-manhood. I understand his niece had never heard him mention them either.

(3) [Mr. Parker] performed three full services on Sunday, Dec. 7 [1913], so that there was much to divert him throughout the day from the thought of Mr. and Mrs. C., which, he says—nevertheless—occupied his mind during the day.

[Signed] F. E. KITCHENER.

Compare with this an experience reported by Miss MacLellan, who has been already referred to above, p. 103. The one in question is No. VII., *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 175. A persistent impression of a friend about the time she was killed in Paris by a German shell is described.

§ 8. *Thought of Agent and his condition.*

The reader will probably turn with relief from these rather vague cases to seven in which the idea of the event and of the person concerned in it (the presumed agent) are combined in the percipient's mind. The first two are death coincidences.

The first (L. 1125), *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 79, is from Mr. J. F. Young, Llanelly, who was the percipient in the case concerning a dog (see above, p. 116). The present case is one of many similar impressions which

Mr. Young has had. The interest of this particular one consists in the fact that Mr. Young at once acted upon the suggestion made to him some time previously by Sir William Barrett, and at the moment of its occurrence wrote down the intimation with the date and hour.

(L. 1125.)

NEW ROAD, LLANELLY, *March 9/01.*

The following account of a presentiment I recently had may be interesting to you.

I was having my supper on the evening of February 15th last, when a message came from a customer requiring my services. I sent back a reply that I would come immediately I had my supper. It has always been a strong point with me to keep my appointments, and therefore, having hastily finished my meal, I was in the act of leaving the table when I suddenly exclaimed, "There!!! I have just had an intimation that Robert is dead": the Robert referred to is a Robert Hallett (a brother-in-law) who was residing near my sister (Mrs. Ponting) at Sturminster Newton, Dorset. He had been bed-ridden from paralysis for this last two years, but had recently been much worse.

I at once entered full particulars in my diary. Date, Feb. 15. Message, and time of message, 9.40 p.m. My sister-in-law was present the whole time, and can vouch for the circumstances. On the 17th I received a post-card from my sister at Sturminster Newton, bearing date Feb. 16th, stating, that "Robert had passed away, will write to-morrow."

In the meantime I had written to my sister Mrs. Ponting, mentioning my presentiment, *and our letters crossed*, for the following morning a letter came from her (I must mention here she had been assisting in nursing my brother-in-law), saying, "I was glad you had a presentiment of poor Robert's release, he passed away at 7.45 p.m., then Lottie [my niece Lottie Hallett] and I came home *till* 9.40, and that was the time you had the impression."

I wish to state two facts in connection with the foregoing case. (1) I was not thinking of him at the time,

my mind being engrossed in my appointment, and the impression came so startlingly sudden, which caused me to hastily say, There!!! . . . as before stated; and (2) at the same moment, I had a sense of a *presence* at my left, so much so, that I looked sharply round, but found no one there.

This was my first and only impression during his long illness.

It will be observed that there is a difference of nearly two hours from the time of his death to the premonition. Had his spirit only then recovered consciousness, or was it a case of telepathy from my sister on her arrival to the quiet of her home, when her thoughts roamed to me? I may say we are devotedly attached to each other, and her psychical faculties are similar to my own. I have sent you post-card, envelope, and part of letter as evidence, and Mrs. Ponting (my sister) will give you every facility to corroborate what I have written. J. F. YOUNG.

The sister-in-law referred to, Miss E. Bennett, has read the above statement and appends the following:

9th March, 1901.

The foregoing is quite correct. (Signed) E. BENNETT.

The note in the diary occurs amongst some memoranda on blank sheets at the end of a small pocket diary. The previous entry is dated February 12th, and the two following entries are dated, in that order, February 28 and February 19. The entry contains, therefore, no internal evidence of having been written at the time. It is as follows:

Feb. 15. As I rose from supper, a message came, as if by spirit influence, to say, "Robert has passed away." Miss Bennett present. I said, "There, I have just had an intimation Robert is dead. Time, 9.40 p.m. Noted full particulars on my return: was called away. Had to see a customer on business."

Mr. Young's original letter to his sister, Mrs. Ponting, has, unfortunately, not been preserved. But we have seen a post-

card from Mrs. Ponting, dated February 16, containing the simple announcement: "Passed away quietly last evening"; also two letters in which Mrs. Ponting refers to Mr. Young's letter. In the first, dated February 19th, she writes:

I was glad to hear you had a presentiment of poor Robert's release. He passed away at a quarter to eight. Then Lottie [Hallett] and I came home till 9.40, so that was the time you had the impression.

In the second letter Mrs. Ponting announces her unsuccessful search for the missing letter from Mr. Young. It had probably been, as she explained, torn up for pipe-lights.

Miss Lottie Young, another niece, to whom Mr. Young related his impression on the morning after its occurrence, sends us the following corroboration:

7 NEW ROAD, LLANELLY, *April 11.*

Accidentally meeting my uncle, Mr. Young, on the morning of Feb. 16th, he informed me that he had had an intimation the previous evening that Mr. Hallett was dead. On Feb. 17th he showed me a post-card (received that day), which stated that Mr. Hallett died on Feb. 15th, thus confirming the intimation. L. YOUNG.

In the next case (P. 262, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 79), the impression occurred about twelve hours before the death of the person it concerned.

(P. 262.)

The Hon. Mrs. Leir-Carleton, Greywell Hill, Winchfield, writes as follows:

Mrs. Hoptroff (resident in this village and mother of my maid, Tilley Hoptroff) underwent an operation on August 20th [1898], in the Victoria Hospital, Bournemouth. Her daughter remained with her until August 23rd, when she was progressing satisfactorily, and insisted upon the girl returning to "keep house for the boys," her brothers. On August 26th, about 9 a.m., I was sitting at my dressing-table, trying to brush my hair, in despite of hindrance from a pet cat (that would play with my

sleeve-ruffles, and was getting scolded, yet encouraged), when I suddenly became aware of this assertion: "Mrs. Hoptroff will pass, to-day." There was no sound, but I felt as clearly impressed with those five words as if they had been uttered close to me. I may remark that "pass" is not an expression I should be likely to use, but this is the second time it has been used to impress me. I sprang to my feet and stared around. My gaze lit upon the writing-table, and (recollecting a similar experience that I had unluckily supposed illusory and neglected to note) I at once scribbled the above sentence, dated, and shut it away. Then I admitted two old servants, (Mrs. Tilley and Mrs. Bolton), and as they entered I asked, "What news of Mrs. Hoptroff?" The answer was, "Oh, much better! The sickness has left her, and the doctor ordered fish for her dinner." I said, "Well . . . I must say I did not expect such good news. Somehow I have had a feeling she might die after all, and perhaps to-day." I did not mention what had made me think this, because their information made me distrust mine, which indeed soon ceased to occupy my thoughts.

That night, at dinner, shortly after 8 o'clock, there was brought to me a telegram, that Tilley Hoptroff had just received from Bournemouth, announcing "a change for the worse." I directed my son where to find my memorandum, which he brought, and everyone present read it.

On Sunday, August 28th, we learnt that Mrs. H. died on the evening of the 26th.

Mrs. Leir-Carleton's account is confirmed by the signed statements (bearing date Aug. 28th, 1898) of her son, Mr. Dudley Carleton, who went to fetch the paper inscribed, "Mrs. Hoptroff will pass to-day, Friday, August 26th, 1898," and of several of the guests present at dinner on the evening in question. Further confirmation is afforded by the testimony of the servants, in whose presence Mrs. Carleton had hinted at her misgivings on the morning of the 26th:

When I came into Mrs. Carleton's room on Friday, August 26th, she asked me if there was any news of Mrs.

Hoptroff. I answered, "*much* better, the sickness has stopped, and she was to have fish for her dinner." Mrs. Carleton looked very serious, and said that she did not expect *good* news, and said, "somehow I have had a feeling that she may *die*, to-day." Mrs. Bolton was also present and will sign her name below mine. This is written down by Lucy Day (housemaid), to whom Mrs. Bolton repeated Mrs. Carleton's remark a few minutes later, after Mrs. Carleton had gone downstairs to breakfast.

ELISABETH TILLEY.

EMILY BOLTON.

LUCY DAY.

We owe the following case (L. 1217, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 193) to the kindness of Mrs. E. S. Russell. There is no doubt that the impression was veridical, but I include it here with some hesitation because we have no evidence that the telepathic agent was any one living, and it may have been a message from the dead.

(L. 1217.)

Mrs. Russell writes :

BRYANS GROUND, PRESTEIGN,
RADNORSHIRE, *March* 12, 1918.

My sister, Mrs. W——, has asked me to write you an account of the story she told you about my small boy.

Unfortunately I did not write it down at the time, so I am not sure as to the date, but it was after November 4th [1917], perhaps several days after, though before the news of my husband's death came to us on November 16th. I think it was most likely on November 8th or 9th, and my husband was killed on November 6th.

Dicky, the small boy, was resting on my bed after lunch and I was sitting by his side sewing, and we were not talking, when he sat up rather suddenly and said, "Daddy is dead." I said, "Oh no, dear, he's not and I expect he'll come back to us some day"; but Dicky looked very upset and became flushed and almost wept and said again, "No he won't, Dick knows he's dead." I just said,

"No, dear, I don't think he is," but Dicky seemed so distressed and repeated, "No, no, Dick knows it" so emphatically that I thought best to leave the subject alone. He never referred to it again and had never said anything of the sort before. When we did say anything about his father it was always as to when he would come back and Dick's usual remark was that he would run and open the gate for him. It was so queer of Dick that I went almost at once and told my sister here of it, but I had no impression at all that my husband was dead, and only thought of it as odd of Dicky. Indeed we had got to look upon my husband's safety as a foregone conclusion, for he had been through Gallipoli, El Arish and the first battle of Gaza without a scratch.

[Signed] ELIZABETH D. RUSSELL.

In reply to questions Mrs. Russell writes on March 16, 1918 :

(1) Dicky was born on August 3rd, 1914 [and was therefore aged $3\frac{1}{4}$ years at the date of his impression].

(2) I think "dead" does convey some meaning to him; he sees hedgehogs, worms, mice and such like animals dead, and always asks about them, "Why dead, Dick wants them alive again"—and he screws up his face into a half tearful state, much as he did when he made the remark about his father; only that time he got very flushed and was much distressed.

(3) No, I don't think it was a dream in the sense of a sleeping dream; he was quiet, but awake. It gave me the idea of an odd freak. I think he is a child with an acute imagination and sensitive; but he's essentially healthy and full of the joy of life, about the happiest child we have ever come across.

(4) Enclosed is my sister's account of the incident.

(5) I can't veraciously give an exact date; but we did go back on it after we heard of my husband's death and fixed it at somewhere between November 8th and 12th.

The account of Mrs. Russell's sister, Miss M. D. Holt, written

from the same address and dated March 17, 1918, is as follows :

I clearly recollect my sister telling me the following incident.

She had taken Dicky, her small son, upstairs for his after dinner rest—the child had been lying quietly on the bed while she was sewing when suddenly he sat up and said, “Daddy’s dead,” My sister said, “Oh no, he’s not, some day he will come back again”; but Dicky repeated, “Daddy’s dead, Dick knows it,” and the child appeared very distressed, so much so that my sister thought it best to humour him and turn his thoughts to something else.

When he had finished his rest, she almost at once found me and told me about it, but even then it never occurred to us that the child’s words were true.

My brother-in-law was killed on November 6th, 1917, and I feel almost sure that it was a few days after that date that this incident happened. Unfortunately neither of us made a note of the exact date at the time.

[Signed] MARY D. HOLT.

The death of Captain Edward Stanley Russell on November 6th, 1917, was announced in the *Times* of November 20.

It will be observed that in this case evidence of any exact coincidence is wanting; but there is no doubt that the little boy’s experience occurred some time before the news of his father’s death was received, and it is almost if not quite certain that it did not occur before the death itself.

The following case (L. 1176, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 99)—an impression concerning illness—was sent to us by Lady Rayleigh, the account being given in a letter from the Countess of Leitrim to Lady Rayleigh :

(L. 1176.)

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, NATAL, *January 28th*, 1909.

Either on Sunday, December 20th, Monday, 21st, or Tuesday, 22nd, 1908, I was conscious of a very definite

knowledge that Lord Rayleigh was seriously ill. I had no dream about him, but so certain was I of the fact that, on coming on deck directly after breakfast, I told my mother, Mrs. Henderson. We were then at sea, somewhere near the Equator, on our way to Cape Town.

I had never had a definite impression in that way before, and was therefore particularly careful to tell my mother at once.

VIOLET LEITRIM.

Mrs. Henderson writes to Lady Rayleigh :

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, NATAL, *January 28th*, 1909.

One morning, in the early part of the week beginning the 20th of December, 1908, my daughter, Lady Leitrim, told me she had a very strong impression that Lord Rayleigh was ill. She said she could not understand why it was, as she had had no dream, but she felt certain that he was very ill.

EMMA C. HENDERSON.

Lady Rayleigh writes :

March 23rd, 1909.

Lord Rayleigh and I went out to Cape Town in November, 1908. We travelled about a good deal, and on December 15th Lord Rayleigh was taken suddenly and violently ill of dysentery, on his way by Cape cart from Mafeking to Zeerust. He managed to make the journey to Pretoria next day, and was laid up at Government House, Pretoria. He was sufficiently recovered to leave his room for a few hours on December 22nd, and to go downstairs on the 25th. He was able to travel to Johannesburg in a sleeping carriage on December 28th.

It was quite impossible for Lady Leitrim to have heard of his illness, as she was on the sea between Madeira and Cape Town at the time.

She knew he was in S. Africa, and was looking forward to possibly meeting him there.

EVELYN RAYLEIGH.

The next case (L. 1103, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 308) concerns an alarm of fire.

(L. 1103.)

Mr. Myers writes: The following case was written down next day and sent to me in French by a scientific friend, who prefers that the narrative should be anonymous.¹ He has had other experiences pointing to thought-transference. The value of the coincidence is more than doubled by the fact that the apprehension was felt also—independently so far as any ordinary communication went—by the percipient's sister.

F. W. H. M.

On Friday, December 10th, 1897, at about 10.35 p.m., being alone and at work in my library, I began to think, without any reason, that there had been a fire at the Opera. My wife and daughter had gone off to the Opera at 8; I had not been able to accompany them. The impression was so strong that I wrote + F [Feu !] on the cover of a book which lay near me. A few instants later, wishing to emphasise this presentiment, I wrote "Att" (for attention), "Fire!". I enclose what I wrote. [Fragment of book-cover sent herewith with the words mentioned.] I did not, however, feel anxious; but said to myself, "There has been no great fire at the Opera, only an alarm of fire."

At the same time, or rather 10 or 15 minutes later, at 10.55, my sister, Mme. B., who lives in the same house, and whose bedroom is on the same floor with my study, had an idea that my study was on fire. She was at the moment on the point of getting into bed, but she came in déshabille to my study door and put her hand on the handle to come in; but then, telling herself that her fear was absurd, she went back to bed. She tells me, however, that she would nevertheless have come in, but that she was afraid that I had someone with me in the room.

¹ There can be no harm now in mentioning that Myers' scientific friend was Professor Charles Richet, as the latter has recently published the incident in his book *Traité de Métapsychique*, p. 352, as his own experience.

At 12.10, my wife and daughter came back from the theatre. They instantly told me that there had been a sort of beginning of a conflagration. I said nothing, and they told me as follows:—Between 8.45 and 9, at the end of the first act of the *Maîtres Chanteurs*, a smell of burning and a light smoke were perceived in the auditorium. My wife said to my daughter: "I will go out and see what is the matter; if I make a sign to you, follow me at once, without saying a word or even waiting to put your cloak on." The attendant whom she asked said that nothing was wrong. Nevertheless, there was some emotion among the audience, and five or six persons in the stalls got up and went away. The smoke came, no doubt, from a stove.

Note that this is the first time that my wife ever left her seat in a theatre from alarm of fire. It is the first time that I have ever been anxious about fire in her absence; and I do not suppose that I jot down my possible presentiments more than five or six times in a year.

My sister has never before been anxious about fire in my room.

With these may be compared two cases in which the impression was connected with the distress of an animal identified at the time by the percipient. One was a vague waking impression of something wrong with the animal; the other was a more definite impression in a dream, but whether there was in the dream any visual or auditory impression we do not know.

The first of the two cases (L. 1144,¹ *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 21) was received through the kindness of Sir Rider Haggard.

Lady Carbery had sent it in consequence of the somewhat similar case which he had contributed to *The Times* of July 21st, 1904, and which was reprinted in full, with additional evidence, in the *Journal* for October, 1904 (see below, p. 219). Lady Carbery wrote to Mr. Haggard:

¹ This case is numbered 1143 in the *Journal* by mistake,

(L. 1144.)

CASTLE FREKE, CO. CORK, *July 25th*, 1904.

Lady Carbery presents her compliments to Mr. Rider Haggard, and thinks he may be interested in the enclosed account of how she was summoned to the help of a favourite mare. The statement could be confirmed by the coachman and others. "Kitty" is still alive, ending her days in the fields among her foals, and doing no work.

The account enclosed was as follows :

On one hot Sunday afternoon in the summer of 1900, I went after luncheon to pay my customary visit to the stables, to give sugar and carrots to the horses, among the number being a favourite mare named Kitty. She was a shy, nervous, well-bred animal, and there existed between us a great and unusual sympathy. I used to ride her every morning before breakfast, whatever the weather might be—quiet solitary rides on the cliffs which overhang the sea at Castle Freke—and it always seemed to me that Kitty enjoyed that hour in the freshness of the day as much as I did. On this particular afternoon I left the stables and walked alone to the garden, a distance of a quarter of a mile, and established myself under a tree with an interesting book, fully intending to remain there for a couple of hours. After about twenty minutes an uncomfortable sensation came between me and my reading, and at once I felt sure that there was something the matter with Kitty. I tried to put the feeling from me and to go on with my book, but the impression grew stronger, and I felt compelled to hasten back to the stables. I went straight to Kitty's box, and found her "cast" and in urgent need of help. The stablemen were in a distant part of the stables, whence I fetched them to help the mare up. Their surprise was great to find me in the stables for the second time that afternoon. . . .

This account was sent to us by Sir Rider Haggard, and Mr. Baggally undertook to make further enquiries into the case. In reply to his first letter, Lady Carbery wrote :

FRANKFIELD HOUSE, CO. CORK, *Dec. 27th, 1904.*

Lady Carbery . . . would be glad indeed to have the case investigated, as it has always seemed to her to be of the greatest possible interest. At the same time it may be difficult at this date to get a statement from the stablemen, one of whom is somewhere in England, but Lady Carbery will try to do so. She is absolutely convinced that *no* one entered the stable. Had the stablemen done so they would at once have helped the mare to get up, and any one else would have given the alarm. It seems a direct case of telepathy from animal mind to human. . . .

Lady Carbery afterwards sent Mr. Baggally a statement from her former coachman, Edward Nobbs, as follow :

NOSELEY HALL STABLES, NEAR LEICESTER,
December 31st, 1904.

I was coachman at Castle Freke at the time, and Lady Carbery came to the stables after luncheon as usual on a Sunday afternoon with carrots and sugar for the horses. Kitty was then loose in her box and quite well. I then went to my rooms over the stables, the other stablemen being also upstairs, and to my surprise about half an hour or three quarters later her Ladyship, who had been to the garden, called me and the other men to come and help Kitty up, as she was lying cast in her box. No one had gone into the stable in the interval.

(Signed) EDWARD NOBBS.

In a letter to Lady Carbery of the same date, enclosing this account, Edward Nobbs writes:—"I remember the Sunday afternoon quite well. Your Ladyship called me from the bottom of the stairs. Jerome McCarthy helped me with the aid of one of the clothing rollers. At that time Kitty was in the centre box. . . ." Lady Carbery tells us that Jerome McCarthy is now in America.

The second case (L. 1158, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 80)

comes from an Associate of the Society, Colonel Coghill, who writes :

(L. 1158.)

COSHEEN, CASTLE TOWNSHEND,
Co. CORK, *April 10th* [1906].

The enclosed case of dream premonition may interest the S.P.R. in adding one more instance for the accumulation of cases for investigation. My nephew, Mr. Penrose, having mentioned the case to me, I wrote for a little more information, which, having been added in the form of a statement from the groom, I now beg to forward.

KENDAL COGHILL.

The narrative written by Mr. Penrose and signed by the groom is as follows :

LISMORE, IRELAND.

On April 2nd [1906], between 4 a.m. and 5 a.m., Robert Glynn, coachman to J. Penrose, Esq., woke suddenly, having dreamed that a mare under his charge had foaled and that he was badly wanted. He immediately dressed and went to the stable, which was about 20 or 30 yards distant from his house, and found the mare had just foaled. The foal was extremely weak, and would undoubtedly have died if he had not come when he did to give it assistance.

The mare was 17 days before her time, being due to foal on April 19th. He had not looked at her for two or three days previously, and there were no symptoms of prematurity nor was he in any anxiety about the foaling. She had had several foals before and had never miscarried before. He did not say anything to his wife before going out to the mare, as she was asleep. He had been in the habit for some days back of getting up early to look at a cow that was expected to calve ; but on this occasion the dream was so vivid he went straight to the mare's stable as soon as he was dressed. He heard no sounds of distress from the mare.

The above is exactly according to the facts stated.

(Signed) ROBERT GLYNN.

§ 9. *True Impressions. Doubtful Agents.*

We may conveniently take next three cases of mental or emotional impressions in dreams. In none can we point to a particular agent, though in all the fact suggested by the dream was known to some living people. The first (G. 237, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 105) may have been due to telepathy from the dead brother, though if so it is not explained why the impression should have occurred just when it did—a few hours before the cablegram which had “been advisedly kept over” reached the percipient. From this point of view this case belongs to a small class, which we shall have to discuss later, where the time at which the impression is received seems oddly to depend on the fact that news of the event corresponding to the impression was approaching the percipient. It is possible in the present case that the telepathic impression came from the person responsible for keeping over the cablegram.

(G. 237.)

The case was received through the American Branch from Miss E. H. Kitching. Both witnesses were known to Dr. Hodgson.

Miss Kitching writes :

141, WEST 60TH STREET, NEW YORK,
April 29th, 1890.

The following is full information as to this experience, which, by the way, is the only one I ever had.

I will say, in the first place, that I am unusually strong and robust, and have always been in perfect health, and also that I have always had a secret belief that only unhealthy and morbid people are subject to psychical experiences.

My brother, J. Howard Kitching, who from his birth suffered from heart disease, was obliged, on account of his ill health, to leave this country in February, 1887. He was appointed U.S. Consular Agent to Bône, Algeria, where he remained until his death, which occurred August 20th, 1888. He grew steadily better in that climate,

and my mother and I had reason to hope he would ultimately become strong. In August, however, he became ill again, and died, having carefully kept from us the fact of his illness. At the time of his death we were at Saratoga, N.Y. The cablegram announcing his death, having been advisedly kept over in New York, did not reach us till noon on the 23rd of August. Early in the morning of the 23rd (it may have been at four or five o'clock, but I do not know the exact hour) I experienced, while lying asleep in bed, a distressing mental impression, as though something dreadful were taking place in connection with my brother, and I awoke with the conviction that he was dead. The mental stress was very painful while it lasted, but as soon as I was completely awake I thought no more about it, until the cablegram came at noon informing us that my brother had died on the 20th.

Even if the impression had weighed on my mind during the morning (which it did not), I should not have spoken of it to my mother, for fear of causing her anxiety.

My brother was always extremely interested in psychical research, and had some very interesting experiences in hypnotism, which power he developed while at Bône. I, however, as I said before, have had no psychical experience except this one.

.

EDITH HOWARD KITCHING.

In reply to Mr. Hodgson's request for corroboration, Mrs. Kitching wrote as follows:

141, WEST 60TH STREET, *May 8th*, 1890.

DEAR SIR,—As to the statement sent to you by my daughter, Edith Kitching, I wish to say that she did not mention to me the fact that she had received a mental communication before the receipt of the cablegram, announcing the death of her brother, but some hours afterwards, after receiving and reading it, she instantly said, "I knew it," and then told me of her experience as written to you.

HARRIET B. KITCHING.

In the next case (P. 269, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 28) there is no one living or dead who is marked out as direct agent, since the persons who possessed the information received by the percipient were entirely unknown to her, and probably did not know of her existence. It would seem that if the information reached her telepathically it was probably in some way through her brother.

(P. 269.)

The following account came from Miss Agnes E. Walker, of 13, Stafford Mansions, Albert Bridge Road, London, S.W. Both Miss Walker and the brother (Mr. Bernard Walker), who was the subject of her dream, are known to Mr. J. G. Piddington, to whom the letters relating to the dream were addressed.

Miss Walker writes :

13, STAFFORD MANSIONS, ALBERT BRIDGE ROAD,
LONDON, S.W., *April 26th*, 1900.

DEAR MR. PIDDINGTON,—You asked me to send you a written statement about a dream, and I do so with much pleasure.

In June, 1897, my youngest brother, B., having passed the examination for a clerkship in Somerset House, but being unable to obtain the actual appointment until a vacancy occurred, threw up work he was then doing in London and went home to Devonshire, intending to take a month or two of holiday before entering Somerset House.

He was not able to get any information as to when a vacancy would occur, as there are no age retirements, and could only learn that the vacancies averaged three a year.

I remained in London. My brother waited at home a whole year and no vacancies occurred.

One night in June, 1898—I cannot give the exact date, but I think it was about the 20th or 23rd—I dreamt that my brother received his appointment on the 19th of July. There was nothing else in the dream—merely the one perfectly vivid fact of the date. I thought very little of it, but in writing to my brother in a day or two,

I mentioned that I had had this dream, and that I hoped it was a good omen.

Naturally no one attached any importance to it, and the letter was in due course destroyed; though my brother did not forget it, and kept the date in his head.

On the 19th of July he received an official notice from Somerset House that he was appointed to a clerkship there, and telegraphed to me to that effect.

We have much regretted since that the letter was destroyed, but the fact of the dream and the date was known to all my family *before* its fulfilment; and I send you the signature of the brother concerned, and of other members of the family who can testify to the accuracy of this statement.—Yours faithfully,

AGNES E. WALKER.

The signatures of other members of Miss Walker's family follow her own, as below :

BERNARD S. WALKER.

CHARLES H. WALKER.

J. B. WALKER.

ETHEL A. WALKER.

E. I. WALKER.

N. WALKER.

In reply to enquiries, Miss Walker writes again to Mr. Piddington :

June 25th [1900].

... My brother's name was first in the list for a whole year, for the next appointment, which could only be given in case of a death or retirement. In his case a vacancy occurred by the retirement of some one in one of the provincial branches, which was filled up—as I believe they always are—from Somerset House, and caused a general move up. It seems most probable that a few weeks before my brother received his appointment these coming changes must have been known to the Registrar, and he would, I should think, be most likely to note the next name on the list.

I find that the official letter, informing my brother of his appointment, is dated July 18th, and is signed by Mr. David Owen, the head registrar. . . .

AGNES E. WALKER.

Mr. Piddington writes :

November 14th, 1900.

In an interview which I had with the Head Registrar at Somerset House this morning, he informed me that the fact of a vacancy having occurred would certainly be known either to himself or to some other of the officials some weeks before the next appointment would be made, and the first name on the list of successful candidates would be noted. Consequently, if the case be not regarded as one of pure coincidence, we can suppose that Miss A. E. Walker in her dream state acquired her information telepathically from one of the Somerset House officials ; for, although the Head Registrar did not say that the *precise* date of a new appointment would be settled as soon as a vacancy was known to have occurred, still it is permissible to assume that the *approximate* date would or could then be known to the official or officials interested.

As to the evidence of the actual date of Mr. Walker's appointment, Mr. Piddington writes later :

November 20th, 1900.

Miss A. E. Walker has sent me the official letter signed by the Senior Registrar, D. N. (or D. W.) Owen. It is dated July 18th, 1898, and is addressed to B. S. Walker, Esq. The envelope, an official one, bearing the stamp of the "High Court of Justice, Probate Registry," bears also the following post-mark: "London. 6.30 p.m. Official paid. 16. 18 Jy. 98." (16 is presumably a post-office mark which signifies the mail by which the letter was dispatched.) The letter is addressed to Bernard S. Walker, Esq., Walkhampton, Horrabridge, S. Devon. But the Horrabridge post-mark is not on the envelope. Doubtless, though, a letter dispatched from London at

6.30 p.m. on July 18th would reach Horrabridge on July 19th.

Another case (L. 1127, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 140) extremely like this, except that there was apparently a visual element in the dream (the percipient says, "As to how I dreamt . . . I only knew I had had the list in my hand with R.'s name 6th"), was sent to us by Dr. H. W. M'Connel of Matlaske Hall, Norwich, an Associate of the Society, to whom the principal witnesses in the case were well known, and who carefully collected the evidence.

(L. 1127.)

Dr. M'Connel drew up the following statement as the result of a conversation with Miss F. (the dreamer), and afterwards showed it to her to make sure of its correctness:

On February 26th, 1900, I dreamt that my brother passed sixth in an examination for the Naval Medical. The letter with result came from the Admiralty on the 28th, and the dream was found correct. The examination was from February 19th-23rd, and I knew that my brother was up in London at it. I was in Edinburgh, and I had no reason for supposing that he might come out any special place. The dream was between 2 a.m. and 8 a.m. on the night of the 26th, and my brother only returned from London on March 1st. I attached no importance at the time to the number in the dream, only feeling depressed at having dreamt he had passed at all, as dreams go very contrary; but fortunately I told the dream that same morning to my brother and sister and a friend.

A. C. F.

This is undated, but Miss F. answered further questions on January 10, 1901, and corroboration of her having told the dream before its veridicality was known was sent by the brother and sister mentioned on January 21, 1901. It was ascertained from one of the examiners that the meeting at which the results of the examination were

determined took place in the evening of February 26—that is, a few hours before the dream, and the letter from the Admiralty announcing the result was posted to the candidate's home address on the 27th. He did not himself learn it till the 28th. According to the *Times* of March 5, 1900, there were twenty names in the list, that of the candidate in question being sixth. The full evidence will be found set out in the *Journal*.

A very similar incident—a mother's veridical dream that her son passed out 8th before she could have heard of it—is mentioned in the course of an account of a series of veridical dreams and impressions of a Mrs. B., also sent to us by Dr. M'Connel, to whom Mrs. B. was well known; but this particular incident was recorded nearly twelve years after the event. See L. 1128, *Journal*, Vol. X., pp. 161-170.

§ 10. *Mental Vision of complicated event.*

I will conclude this chapter with a case (L. 1160, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 116) in which the percipient has a vision—apparently not externalised, a vision in the mind's eye—of the condition and surroundings of the agent. I have already quoted one such case (L. 1152, see above, p. 58) among semi-experimental cases, though it might quite well have been placed in the present section. Both in that case and in the one to be quoted the percipient's mind was normally directed to the agent. Without this we can hardly suppose that in the first case the impression would have occurred, and it is at least highly probable that this preoccupation facilitated the impression in the second case. The case has the advantage from an evidential point of view that the vision represented a very definite and presumably unusual incident. The case comes from America, and Dr. Hodgson first received a second or third hand account written ten days earlier than the one we print, but substantially agreeing with it, from Mrs. Ward, a sister of the percipient, Mrs. Robinson. Both ladies were Associates of the American Branch.

(L. 1160.)

The percipient Mrs. Robinson writes to Dr. Hodgson :

BONNYCOT, ANCHORAGE,
KENTUCKY, *June 7th*, 1903.

In compliance with my sister's request and yours as well as with my own interest in psychic phenomena, I shall write you of this last experience that came to me on the night of May 17th.

My son and a friend had driven across the country to dine and spend the evening with friends. The rest of the household had retired for the night. I was awakened by the telephone and looked at the clock, finding it 11.30 p.m. I knew my son would soon be in and thought of a window downstairs which I felt might not have been locked, and determined to remain awake and ask my son to make sure that it was secure. As I lay waiting and listening for him I suddenly saw their vehicle, a light break-cart, turn over, my son jump out, land on his feet, run to the struggling horse's head, his friend hold to the lines, and in a moment it was gone and I knew it was right and felt no disturbance.

I met my son as he came in and spoke of the window. He said: "We tipped over, mother." I replied "Yes. I know it, I saw you," and described what I saw as I have to you, which he said was just as it happened. He also said: "I thought for a moment the horse would go up over the railroad tracks," and then I remembered that the horse, as I saw him, was thrown up an embankment. I said: "This happened about half-an-hour ago." He looked at his watch, it was 12.15, and said "Yes." I did not see them before they started out, as his friend called for him with his horse and vehicle, and I did not know in what style they went. . . .

HELEN AVERY ROBINSON.

Mrs. Robinson's son confirms the account as follows :

June 23rd, 1903.

On Sunday night, May 17th, I was driving with a friend from Glenview to Anchorage, Kentucky. We left Glenview

at about eleven o'clock. We were in a break-cart, and my friend was driving a young and spirited horse. There was no moon, and we could see indistinctly by star-light. About twelve o'clock, when about two miles from home, we were driving along the edge of a wood with a deep railroad cut on our right. The top of this embankment had lately been levelled off and my friend mistook it for the road, which was just beside the embankment and, in the faint light, seemed to be about level with it. When I called his attention to his mistake he turned down into the road and overturned the cart. We were both thrown out. The horse was startled and began rearing. I ran around the cart after him and took him by the bridle, although my friend had not lost his hold on the reins. We righted the cart and got home without further accident. The family had been in bed for some time, but my mother had been aroused at eleven-thirty by the telephone. As I came in she gave me the message. I told her that we had overturned the cart. She then told me that she had seen the accident at twelve o'clock and, without suggestion from me, described it accurately. She had seen me thrown out backward and knew how I had run around after the frightened horse to catch his bridle, which I did only after he had turned completely around.

AVERY ROBINSON.

CHAPTER III.

SPONTANEOUS CASES IN WHICH THE PERCIPIENT'S IMPRESSION IS EXTERNALISED AS A WAKING HALLUCINATION.
ALSO DREAMS OF THE SAME CHARACTER.

§ 1. *Death Coincidences.*

Waking hallucinations of the senses corresponding with an external event unknown to the percipient afford on the whole the most striking evidence of telepathic communication between agent and percipient, chiefly because such waking hallucinations are themselves rare. Most of us go through life without having experienced one. At the same time, rare as they are, their occurrence is most often not veridical—it is only in a minority of cases that there is ground for supposing them to have a telepathic origin. It is therefore necessary to examine carefully not only the evidence for the hallucinatory nature of the percipient's experience, but that for the definite character of the agent's, as well as the degree of correspondence in time and otherwise between the two. One of the most definite possible events on the side of the agent, and one concerning which there can seldom be any mistake, is his death. I will therefore take first the class of death coincidences—meaning by a death coincidence an apparition or other hallucinatory experience or dream occurring within twelve hours of the death, before or after it.

Death Coincidences—(a) Realistic Apparitions.

By a realistic apparition I mean one that appears like a real person in the percipient's surroundings.

Perhaps the best evidenced death coincidence in the present collection is the realistic apparition of Lieutenant M'Connel (L. 1226, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 76). It was spoken of by the percipient to another person, who corroborates, before it was realised that it was not the living man, and it was recorded in writing within fifteen days of the event. The case reached us through Sir Oliver Lodge, to whom a report was sent in the first instance. The apparition was that of Lieut. David E. M'Connel, R.A.F., who was killed in a flying accident on December 7, 1918, and the percipient was one of his fellow-officers, Lieut. J. J. Larkin, R.A.F. The earliest report of the occurrence was contained in a letter to Sir Oliver Lodge from Lieut. M'Connel's father, Mr. D. R. M'Connel, who writes thus :

(L. 1226.)

January 16, 1919.

Knowing your interest in psychical affairs, I take the liberty of giving you the particulars of the reported appearance of my son at the time of his death through an accident while flying. I enclose the copy of the written statement of Lieut. Jas. J. Larkin of Scampton Aerodrome, to whom the appearance was made. I heard of the occurrence at my son's funeral on the 11th December (he was killed on the 7th December) and wrote as soon as I could to Lieut. Larkin, who replied on the 22nd December. The statement made to me on the 11th by Lieut. Hillman, who has attested the correctness of the account given, corresponds accurately with the account itself. Lieut. Hillman had not been back to Scampton, or seen Lieut. Larkin, between the time of the funeral and the writing of the account. Lieut. Hillman wrote his attestation on reading the account in my house. The event seems to have made a very vivid impression on the two or three of my son's friends who heard of it. . . . One other matter of fact I may mention. My son was fully dressed for flying, with helmet, when he started. We happen to have a snapshot of him taken by a fellow-officer just before he climbed into the "camel" which he flew. The account states that he "appeared" with his

naval cap on. My son began his flying career in March last, entering through the R.N.A.S. before the amalgamation of the R.N.A.S. with the R.F.C. His elder brother had entered the R.N.A.S. and my son David was proud of his connection with the earlier service. Having a complete kit of the naval flying service, he always wore the naval flying uniform about the aerodrome, and was one of only three at the drome who had followed the same course in entering. His naval uniform was therefore well known. It would not be at all an unusual thing that he should have taken off his uncomfortable helmet on arriving back at the hangar, and exchanged it for his naval cap. Under the circumstances, however, it is to be remarked that he wore his helmet at the time of the accident; and in the appearance to Lieut. Larkin wore the naval cap. His mother informs me that he was dressed, as usual, in his naval uniform below his flying things, and that he had his naval cap with him in the fusilage to wear on reaching Tadcaster—the usual action. The O.C. states that my son left Scampton for Tadcaster at 11.35 a.m. December 7, '18.

The circumstances of the flight were as follows. My son, with other officers, had been to a dance at Lincoln on the night of the 6th December. He got up rather late on the morning of the 7th, missed parade, and also had no breakfast. The formal completion of all his tests for "getting his wings" were to take place on the 7th. As the account states, he was on his way to start for the Aerial Range to shoot off those final tests when he was asked by the O.C. to take one of two "camels" to Tadcaster. He went therefore unexpectedly, rather fatigued, and without food. I may say here that his O.C. considered him a "born flyer," and that he was a very cautious and careful flyer, though not shirking necessary risks. By most unusual favour, he had been accepted for permanent service *before* he had won his "wings"—had been nominated for an instructorship in flying, and was to have left for the Camp of Instructors on the Monday following Saturday, 7th December. The weather was fair when he left Scampton to fly to Tadcaster a

distance of 60 miles. He was accompanied by another "Avro" plane—a 2-seater—which was to have brought him back to Scampton after delivery of the "camel." You are probably aware that a "camel" scout plane is a notoriously difficult and sensitive one, and requires continued strain and effort to keep it down. At Doncaster the two planes ran into fog. My son and his Avro companion descended, and my son described the situation to his flight commander and asked for instructions by telephone. The reply was "Use your own discretion." We suppose that my son's anxiety to finish his tests prompted him to continue. His companion states that neither of them lunched at Doncaster. Between Doncaster and Tadcaster the fog became very thick. The Avro man had to come down, and made a forced landing, successfully. My son circled round him to see that he was all right and continued his flight to Tadcaster. Sixty miles is not a long flight. But the fog was very dense. In order to keep touch with the solid a flyer has to keep his plane under such circumstances about 150 ft. above the surface of the ground—a feat in a camel of considerable difficulty. My son must have encountered difficulty, as he did not approach Tadcaster till nearly 3.30. Allowing for $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ hour for the descent at Doncaster, he must have been flying for about $3\frac{1}{4}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours on this occasion. I am told that it is as much as an ordinary flyer can do to fly a camel for 2 hours. The strain on the arms is intense. In fact, his mother, who saw his body on Monday the 9th at midday, observed that his hands were tightly clenched and his forearms swollen. As he at last approached the Tadcaster Aerodrome, the machine was seen approaching by a man on the road about $\frac{1}{4}$ mile distant from the camp, who reported the fog to be extremely dense. During the evidence at the inquest a girl, or young woman, said she was watching the plane, and saw it apparently "side-slip," then right itself. It flew steadily for a minute or two, then mounted suddenly and immediately "nose-dived" and crashed. The engine was full on when the crash occurred. My son was thrown violently forward—his head striking the gun before him,

which was not hooded. One arm was broken, one leg was torn. The girl ran to the spot and "found the officer dead." The violence of contact seems to have stopped his watch, which registered 3.25 p.m. His cigarette case was almost doubled up. These are the circumstances of the accident, so far as I am aware of them. I am informed by flying men that the reaction on reaching safety after a difficult flight is so "terrible," that fainting is not unknown. My son, it is thought, may have fainted; hence the crash, and his inability to save himself. Or there was possibly engine trouble. I am told also that when shot, or in danger, the immediate thought of the flyer is usually a quite trivial one, such as the sudden desire for a cup of cocoa, or to get undressed at camp, etc. I mention this because the "appearance" was not made at my son's home, or to his mother, who was there at the time, but in his own camp-room, and to a person who was a comparative stranger. However, his mother did have a strange impression at the hour of his death, of which she is writing an account herewith enclosed.¹

My son had a happy, even joyous disposition. He had a brisk step and manner which would account for the "noise and clatter," which Lieut. Larkin remarked and reports in his account. My son was 18 on the 15th April, 1918, having left Bedales School, Hants, before military age, to enter the R.N.A.S. He had been head-boy at Bedales during that winter term. He was the youngest headboy Bedales had had. . . . At Scampton, as at school, his conduct, character, and disposition made him as much loved as respected. His friends and his O.C. report that, though they are all accustomed to the sudden deaths which repeatedly occur, when the news of David's death reached camp, the camp was completely "broken up."

I write these words to you that you may see what bearing his character may have had on the "appearance," if indeed character has any influence in such things.

DAVID R. M'CONNEL.

¹ This account was sent to the Society, but not printed in the *Journal*.

Enclosed with Mr. M'Connel's letter was an account by Lieut. Larkin of his experience, together with two corroborative statements from fellow-officers, thus :

34 T.D.S., ROYAL AIR FORCE,
SCAMPTON, LINCOLN, *December 22, 1918.*

David [M'Connel], in his flying clothes, about 11 a.m. went to the hangars intending to take a machine to the "Aerial Range" for machine gun practice. He came into the room again at 11.30 and told me that he did not go to the range, but that he was taking a "camel" to Tadcaster drome. He said, "I expect to get back in time for tea. Cheero." He walked out and half a minute later, knocked at the window and asked me to hand him out his map, which he had forgotten. After I had lunch, I spent the afternoon writing letters and reading, sitting in front of the stove fire. What I am about to say now is extraordinary to say the least, but it happened so naturally that at the time I did not give it a second thought. I have heard and read of similar happenings and I must say that I always disbelieved them absolutely. My opinion had always been that the persons to whom these appearances were given were people of a nervous, highly-strung, imaginative temperament, but I had always been among the incredulous ones and had been only too ready to pooh-pooh the idea. I was certainly awake at the time, reading and smoking. I was sitting, as I have said, in front of the fire, the door of the room being about eight feet away at my back. I heard someone walking up the passage; the door opened with the usual noise and clatter which David always made; I heard his "Hello boy!" and I turned half round in my chair and saw him standing in the doorway, half in and half out of the room, holding the door knob in his hand. He was dressed in his full flying clothes but wearing his naval cap, there being nothing unusual in his appearance. His cap was pushed back on his head and he was smiling, as he always was when he came into the rooms and greeted us. In reply to his "Hello boy!" I remarked, "Hello! back already?" He replied, "Yes. Got there

all right, had a good trip." I am not positively sure of the exact words he used, but he said, "Had a good trip," or "Had a fine trip," or words to that effect. I was looking at him the whole time he was speaking. He said, "Well, cheero!" closed the door noisily and went out. I went on with my reading and thought he had gone to visit some friends in one of the other rooms, or perhaps had gone back to the hangars for some of his flying gear, helmet, goggles, etc., which he may have forgotten. I did not have a watch, so could not be sure of the time, but was certain it was between a quarter and half-past three, because shortly afterwards Lieut. Garner-Smith came into the room and it was a quarter to four. He said, "I hope Mac (David) gets back early, we are going to Lincoln this evening." I replied, "He *is* back, he was in the room a few minutes ago!" He said, "Is he having tea?" and I replied that I did not think so, as he (Mac) had not changed his clothes, but that he was probably in some other room. Garner-Smith said, "I'll try and find him!" I then went into the mess, had tea, and afterwards dressed and went to Lincoln. In the smoking room of the Albion Hotel I heard a group of officers talking, and overheard their conversation and the words "crashed," "Tadcaster" and "M'Connel." I joined them and they told me that just before they had left Scampton, word had come through that M'Connel had "crashed" and had been killed taking the "Camel" to Tadcaster. At that moment I did not believe it, that he had been killed on the Tadcaster journey. My impression was that he had gone up again after I had seen him, as I felt positive that I had at 3.30. Naturally I was eager to hear something more definite, and later in the evening I heard that he *had* been killed on the Tadcaster journey. Next morning, Garner-Smith and I had a long discussion about my experience. He tried to persuade me that I must have been mistaken, that I had not actually seen Mac on the previous afternoon about 3.30, but I insisted that I *had* seen him. As you can understand, Mr. M'Connel, I was at a loss to solve the problem. There was no disputing the fact that he *had* been killed whilst

flying to Tadcaster, presumably at 3.25, as we ascertained afterwards that his watch had stopped at that time. I tried to persuade myself that I had not seen him or spoken to him in this room, but I could not make myself believe otherwise, as I was undeniably awake and his appearance, voice, manner had all been so natural. I am of such a sceptical nature regarding things of this kind that even now I wish to think otherwise, that I did not see him, but I am unable to do so.

The foregoing are just the plain facts of the case. Would you please give me your opinion? I have given you every detail and described easily and naturally just as it happened. I must thank you very much for David's photograph. I shall always treasure it. We had been very good friends though not intimate friends in the true sense of the word, as though I had known him for about four months, we had been room-mates for about six weeks only. We had lots of discussions, political, social, and educational, but not once did we discuss anything bordering on the occult or spiritual. Had we done so, I would perhaps have been able to account, in a measure, for his appearance in this room at the time of his death. As it is, I have no explanation whatever to offer.

JAS. J. LARKIN, *2nd Lt. R.A.F.*

CORROBORATIVE STATEMENTS.

Mr. Larkin has related almost word for word what he told me on the afternoon of the 7th [December, 1918], at about a quarter to four. Knowing the type of man he is, I most certainly believe this strange occurrence, but am at a loss to explain it.

GERARD GARNER-SMITH, *Lt. R.A.F.*

On Sunday morning, December 8th [1918], Mr. Larkin told me the story exactly as he has written it down here. I have known Larkin rather intimately for some time, and although at any other time I would have been inclined to disbelieve a story of this nature, knowing Larkin as I do and as he is, I am convinced of his story as he has told it.

R. MOWAT HILLMAN, *Lt. R.A.F.*

In reply to a further enquiry, the following letter was received from Lieut. Larkin giving additional details concerning the circumstances in which his experience took place:

REPATRIATION DEPOT, R.A.F.,
BLANDFORD, DORSET, *June 27, 1919.*

The Society already has my detailed description of the occurrence—regarding the time, it was about 3.25, or rather between 3.20 and 3.30 p.m. The room was quite small, about 12 feet square, and at the time the electric light was on and also a good fire burning in an open stove. I may mention that the light was particularly good and bright, and there were no shadows or half shadows in the room. Outside it was still quite light, but being a foggy, cold day, I had my door closed and the light on and the fire going. I think that is all the additional information you require, as I understand from Mr. M'Connel's letter. JAS. J. LARKIN, *2nd Lt. R.A.F.*

Lieut. Garner-Smith's corroborative statement supplies evidence that Lieut. Larkin had identified the man who entered his room on December 7, 1918, as Lieut. M'Connel *before* he could have had any normal knowledge of the accident which had only just occurred. The identification cannot therefore be due to any trick of memory consequent on the news of the accident. That being so, the only normal explanation which could be made to cover the facts would be one of mistaken identity. It was with this possibility in mind that we questioned Lieut. Larkin concerning the lighting of the room. Obviously such a mistake would be far more likely to occur in a dim light. Lieut. Larkin's reply on this point is satisfactory. The light, he tells us, was good, and under these circumstances it is very difficult to suppose that Lieut. Larkin could mistake a man, with whom he actually had conversation at a distance of only a few feet, for another man with whose voice and appearance he was perfectly familiar. A further argument against the theory of mistaken identity is that Lieut. Larkin observed that the man who entered his room was wearing a naval cap. This was worn by only two other men at the aerodrome besides Lieut. M'Connel, neither

of whom, as we are assured by Mr. M'Connel, who is personally acquainted with them, "could either in height, or build, or manner, or voice, have been mistaken for my son."

I may add to these observations of the ³Editor, that, apart from other reasons given, the hypothesis of mistaken identity seems very difficult to maintain in face of the recognition, not only of appearance, but of voice and of manner of entering the room. Indeed, it would almost seem as if the person mistaken for Lieutenant M'Connel, if there was one, must have taken on his semblance to an extent amounting to a monstrous illusion, approaching so nearly to hallucination that its occurrence at the very time, or within a few minutes of Lieutenant M'Connel's death, would itself suggest the operation of telepathy.

It will be observed that we know the apparition to have been seen within a few minutes of the death, but not whether it occurred before or after or at the actual moment. If it preceded the death, Lieutenant M'Connel dreaming in a fainting condition may have imagined his expedition successfully accomplished and himself returned to his quarters. In this case the details of the apparition may have been due to the agent. They are, however, also what might naturally be supplied by the percipient, given the time and place. A case in which the apparition occurred during a period of unconsciousness of the agent, and undoubtedly before his actual death is L.977 (see below, p. 203).

We may take next the only other death coincidence in our collection in which the apparition speaks (L.1146, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 59).

(L. 1146.)

The case was sent to us by Professor A. Alexander of Rio, who writes regarding it as follows:

CAIXA 906, RIO DE JANEIRO, *February 4th*, 1905.

. . . You will see that it is one of deferred visual and auditory hallucination announcing the death of the ap-

parent agent. The deposition of the percipient and of her husband and daughter is contained in that part of my narrative which begins with the words, "Now before his death Cavalcante—" and ends with "—normal cause be found to account for the noise." The Rieken, so far as I could make out, have never troubled themselves about spiritualistic matters, but they gave their evidence frankly and without reserve. The thing happened and they told me how it happened. The girl looked upon the hallucination merely as a proof that her mother was superstitious. Superstition alone does not explain away the coincidence. Telepathic agency is all the more probable for the reason that between Frau Rieken and her intended son-in-law there existed much sympathy and affection. On my first visit to Copacabana I examined the room where the apparition was seen. . . .

The account written by Professor Alexander is as follows :

In the first half of November, 1904, popular disorders in Rio de Janeiro, which were ostensibly a protest against the government project of obligatory vaccination, culminated in the revolt of the Military School. Marching from their quarters on the evening of the 14th of that month, under the command of General Travassos, the students met and scattered the police force sent to intercept them. The firing took place about 11 o'clock p.m. at the spot where the Rua da Passagem opens on to the Botafogo shore. The neighbouring gas-lamps had been extinguished and the night was very dark, so that it is impossible to know the exact details of all that occurred. It is certain, however, that one of the first victims of this encounter was the *alferes-alumno*,¹ João Sylvestre Cavalcante, who was, it seems, wounded in the back as he retired from a parley with the general in command of the police and then killed outright by a second shot through the head. This occurrence was partly witnessed by his comrade, Ensign Potyguára, who led a company in the

¹ A military student who in the course of his studies has attained to the rank of ensign.

vanguard. The written deposition of the latter is here given : ¹

“ S. CHRISTOVAM, *January 24th, 1905.*

“ I declare that on the night between the 14th and 15th of November, about 11 o'clock in the evening, the Military School, under the command of General Travassos, having halted in the Rua da Passagem, the *alferes-alumno* João Sylvestre Cavalcante was sent by the said general to parley with General Piragibe, who was in command of the police brigade. Immediately after the parley, as the said *alferes-alumno* was returning, he was shot in the back by a bullet that came from the police brigade. On passing by me he told me he was wounded, and riding (by my advice) to the rear of the School, he fell immediately afterwards, and was dragged for a short distance by the horse which he was riding.

“ *N.B.*—When the *alferes-alumno* João Sylvestre Cavalcante was crossing the Rua da Passagem, he was wounded by a Mauser bullet in the right parietal [bone], and this shot killed him.

“ ENSIGN TERTULIANO POTYGUARA.”

This account of the death is said to be current among the military students who are now detained in the different barracks awaiting their trial by court-martial.² One of these, Mario Clementino de Carvalho, declares that they left their quarters shortly after 10 o'clock and exchanged shots with the police about 11—certainly not later than 11.15. He struck a match, and looked at Cavalcante after he had fallen. The poor lad lay in a muddy gutter, his horse dead on the pavement beside him. The evidence of this witness and others determines within narrow limits the time of the death. It must have taken place between a quarter to eleven and a quarter past, and most probably just about the hour itself.

Now before his death Cavalcante had become engaged to a certain Fräulein Maria Luiza Rieken, the daughter of Herr

¹ Professor Alexander sends us the original Portuguese statement of this witness, as well as his translation of it.—EDITOR.

² One of the officers who was with General Piragibe thinks that Cavalcante fell at the first shot. Probably the account of the students is the correct one.

Rieken, a thriving military tailor established in this city, and of Frau Louise Rieken. This family lives at No. 20A Rua Barata Ribeiro, Copacabana, and, as the *fiancé* of the daughter, Cavalcante, who lived close by, was of course a constant visitor at the house, and was accustomed to take his early coffee there before proceeding to the School. On the morning of the 14th he had returned at 9 o'clock to breakfast, which he shared with 'Mimí,' as the young lady was familiarly called. He was in good spirits, and although there was some peculiarity in his manner of taking leave, it is not likely that he had any presentiment of his approaching fate. Shortly before, indeed, he had made the hypothesis of his own death a subject for jest. He left Copacabana never to return there alive.

No reports whatever respecting the adhesion of the School to the insurrectionary movement reached the family that day. About 11 p.m. by their house clock (which was, however, too slow) a sound of firing was heard from over the hill. But when, in spite of the advanced hour, Cavalcante did not return, Frau Rieken felt very anxious, and for some time after she had retired to bed this state of uneasiness kept her awake. The room occupied by her and her husband is in the upper part of the house, but as it is a small one and filled with large-sized furniture, the door is left wide open for the sake of ventilation. She had already heard the clock strike two; it was therefore between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning when she suddenly saw Cavalcante standing at the entrance looking in upon her. He leant against the side of the door, his right hand raised and holding to the jamb and his left arm behind his back. He did not wear the regulation uniform in which he had been killed, but presented himself in the khaki undress he usually wore at home—on his head a felt hat with the brim turned down and a rose-coloured neckerchief round his neck. He seemed to be covered with mud and his face was overcast with sadness. "*Guarda Mimí,*" he said. ("Take care of Mimí.") Frau Rieken's first surprise was succeeded by a sense of the impropriety of his being in that part of the house at such an hour, and she was about to awake her husband. But on looking again the doorway was a blank—Cavalcante had vanished—it was but a vision.

Next morning, before any news had reached them, she told

Herr Rieken and her daughter of her strange nocturnal experience. Neither of them was willing to believe that the vision had any significance. On walking down to the electric-car station at 8 o'clock Herr Rieken was informed of the occurrence of the revolt and of Cavalcante's death by some young men who were there reading the papers. At first he gave absolutely no credit to the report, and was convinced of its truth only after it had been confirmed by two naval officers of his acquaintance. He proceeded at once to the Military School, whither the body had been transported. In preparing it for burial he cut away the uniform, which, although not the same as that seen in the vision, was indeed stained with the mud of the street. The shirt underneath was soaked with blood, and a bullet had passed through the head from one side to the other. Herr Rieken was also told that the lad had been dragged by his horse after he had fallen.

About a month later the same percipient had another visual hallucination, to which, however, there seems to have been no coincidence in objective events. She saw the young man seated in his usual careless attitude on one of the chairs in her sitting-room.

Cavalcante had nearly completed his course of military studies. He was noted for his application and intelligence, and recommended himself to all who knew him by a most insinuating address. He was nearly 27 years old at the date of his death.

The loss of their intended son-in-law has not been the only misfortune which the Riekens have had to bear in recent times. One of their children, a boy nine years of age, had been previously killed by a passing car. Some three hours before this accident a crash as of breaking crockery or bottles had been heard in their store-room. On going thither they found everything in perfect order, nor could any normal cause be found to account for the noise.

From this account, which has been carefully drawn up and corrected in accordance with the statements of the various witnesses, it appears that the lapse of time between Cavalcante's death at Botafogo and its nunciation at Copacabana

was roughly three hours—probably a little more. For some days there had been disorders in town, and both by day and night there had been firing in the streets. Of this nobody was ignorant. But the news of the revolt of the Military School spread very late and evidently did not reach the Rieken in the retired spot where they lived. It is an important point in the evidence that Frau Rieken told her husband and daughter of her hallucination before any of them had the slightest inkling of the events of the night. The family formally certify to the correctness of that part of the above narrative that contains their own oral deposition :

“ COPACABANA, *January 28th*, 1905.

“ We, the undersigned, herewith declare that everything happened exactly as it has been described by Mr. Alexander.

“ FRIEDRICH RIEKEN.

“ LOUISE RIEKEN.

“ MARIA LUIZA RIEKEN.”

The original of the above note, written in German, was sent to us by Professor Alexander.

The next case (L. 980, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 8) is interesting on account of its peculiarity. The percipient was a child too young to realise the circumstances, but there can be little doubt that she had a definitely externalised waking hallucination of sight about two hours after the death of “little Jack.” At the same time, it is rather difficult to suppose agency of the dying infant specially directed to the percipient. It seems more natural to imagine a kind of diffused telepathy in which the dying child’s mother, the anxious mother of the percipient, and the clerk through whom the news of the death was normally communicated (and whose knowledge seems to have timed the hallucination), may all have been more or less concerned as well as the child who saw the apparition, though it was only in the case of the latter that the telepathic impact produced any conscious effect. If this conjecture is right, it may help to explain other cases. *E.g.* where there seems to be something arbitrary in the

choice of the percipient, some special condition in himself may account for his being the only person in whom a more widely diffused telepathic impulse makes itself manifest. The case was sent to us by the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, who has obtained for us at different times other important spontaneous cases. He writes in sending this one :

(L. 980.)

2 QUARRY BANK, HESWALL, CHESHIRE, *May 11, 1894.*

The accompanying case has the merit of recent occurrence. "Little Jack" died from convulsions with teething. The Michells are proprietors of lead works at St. Helens, Lancashire.

J. A. MACDONALD.

The account is given by the percipient's mother. She writes :

THE HOLLIES, ST. HELENS, LANCASTER, *May 8, 1894.*

On the 25th of last month I was sitting in the nursery, and my little daughter Gwendoline was playing with her dolls, and she suddenly laughed so as to attract my attention, and I asked her what she was laughing at. She said, "O mother, I thought I saw little Jack in that chair"—a vacant chair in the room—and indicating her little cousin. About five minutes after this the clerk telephoned from the office saying he had just received a telegram from Penzance announcing the death of little Jack. It was about half-past nine in the morning when the incident occurred in the nursery at St. Helens. The death in Penzance took place about half-past seven on the same morning.

E. MICHELL.

In reply to our further inquiries Mr. Michell wrote :

May 28, 1894.

Gwendoline is five years and four months old. I am not aware that she has had any previous experience of the kind related to Mr. Macdonald, but that the one in question is a fact I have not the slightest doubt.

She knows the head clerk at our office, and he has often conversed with her, and occasionally played with her in an ordinary way.

The impression she had was just prior to the clerk's telephoning to my wife, and although the clerk did not think about my daughter missing Jack at all, yet Mrs. Michell herself was anxiously wondering what the news respecting Jack would be.

There was no one else in the nursery besides my wife and daughter, but Mrs. Michell was very deeply impressed with the matter, and then to receive the message very shortly after forced the matter upon her mind still deeper, and she told me immediately I arrived home.

JAS. J. MICHELL.

An apparition to a young child is also an element in the following case (L. 1223, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 39), and we apparently have in it a telepathic impulse not only widely diffused but widely manifested. Three persons in three different places seem to have received some intimation of the death of the agent, Captain Bowyer-Bower, at about the time of his death or very shortly afterwards, before any normal knowledge of what had occurred could have reached those concerned. We owe the case in the first instance to Mr. Hubert Wales, who has collected the necessary evidence.

(L. 1223.)

The following notice of the death of the agent appeared in the *Court Journal* of June 1, 1917 :

BOWYER-BOWER.—Previously reported missing, now reported killed in action on March 19th, Eldred Wolferstan Bowyer-Bower, Captain the East Surrey Regiment and R.F.C., son of Captain and Mrs. T. Bowyer-Bower, of 30, Bramham Gardens, S.W., and of Ashanti, and grandson of the late Major-General Henry Bower, aged twenty-two years. (Captain Bower's body, beside his beriddled plane, was found and recovered by his own father on May 10th.) No mourning.

It appears from information received by Captain Bowyer-Bower's mother (see below) that his death occurred in the early morning.

1. The most remarkable of the experiences which have been reported to us was an apparition of Captain Bowyer-Bower which was seen by his half-sister Mrs. Spearman in India, within a few hours of his death. Mrs. Spearman's original report of her experience was obtained under the following circumstances.

Shortly after Captain Bowyer-Bower's death, his fiancée, Miss Highett, had a sitting with a professional medium, Mrs. Brittain, at which a statement was made which Miss Highett reports thus in a letter to Mr. Wales :

Wed. 12th June [1918].

I wish to tell you that Mrs. Brittain was quite a stranger to Captain and Mrs. Bower and me. My interview with her took place on September 29th, 1917. After telling me many things about Mrs. Bower's son she said, "He has a sister." I said, "Yes, Cicely." She said, "No, that's not the name." She waited a few seconds and then said: "Joan. She has a little girl called Joan, now I get Dorothy." I said, "Yes." He says, "Tell Dorothy she has the power to communicate." He also said, "She is not in this country." ÆTA HIGHETT.

Mrs. Bowyer-Bower wrote to her step-daughter, Mrs. Dorothy Spearman (Captain Bower's half-sister) in India, with reference to the statements made to Miss Highett at this sitting. The following passage is extracted from Mrs. Spearman's reply :

CALCUTTA, 2 Jan., 1918.

. . . Now I have never told you this before because I was afraid you would not understand. Eldred was greatly on my mind when baby was born, and I could only think of him. On March 19th, in the late part of the morning, I was sewing and talking to baby, Joan was in the sitting-room and did not see anything. I had a great feeling I must turn round and did, to see Eldred ; he looked so happy and that dear mischievous look. I

was so glad to see him, and told him I would just put baby in a safer place, then we could talk. "Fancy coming out here," I said, turning round again, and was just putting my hands out to give him a hug and a kiss, but Eldred had gone. I called and looked for him. I never saw him again. At first [I] thought it was simply my brain. Then I did think for a second something must have happened to him and a terrible fear came over me. Then again I thought how stupid I was, and it must be my brain playing tricks. But now I know it was Eldred, and all the time in Church at baby's christening he was there, because I felt he was and know he was, only I could not see him. All the time I thought why do I feel like this when Eldred is safe. And Mrs. K—— kept on telling me to look more cheerful . . .

Mrs. Bowyer-Bower states that Mrs. Spearman was at a hotel in Calcutta at the time referred to in the above extract, and in a letter to Mr. Wales she says :

26th May, 1918.

. . . The little boy whose Christening is mentioned was to have been *his* godson and the day *he* was baptized Eldred fell. Dolly [Mrs. Spearman] did not of course know of Eldred's death or even that he was out in France again, as he had been home several months and [had] only returned there three weeks when killed . . .

In reply to a question addressed to her by Mrs. Bowyer-Bower as to whether she had informed any one of her experience before she knew of Captain Bowyer-Bower's death, Mrs. Spearman wrote thus :

DARJEELING, August 3rd [1918].

. . . I can only tell him [Mr. Wales] I saw Eldred, and, Peggy, I shall never forget the joy that went through me or the horror when I looked and called and could not find him or make him hear. No, I did not tell any one before I heard of his death and have not up to now. I did not tell Alec¹ because I knew he did not believe as I

¹ Mrs. Spearman's husband,

did. When I told him how Mrs. B—— saw the W—— boy, Alec said it must have been a dream. One day Alec said, I wonder if any one has seen Eldred, and I said yes I have, and I explained what I saw and how I felt, and when I went to the Grand we took the same rooms and I showed him where Alley stood. He now believes we can see those who have gone. His belief is the same as my own. If Alec had been with me at the time, I would have called out to him and asked if he had seen Eldred, was he in the sitting-room. I only knew the K——s in Calcutta, and often when I spoke to them they would laugh. So I never said a word about Alley. In fact I thought it might be my own madness. I started a letter to you the same day and tore it up as I thought you would only say it was cracked. . . .

Subsequently a further statement concerning her experience was obtained from Mrs. Spearman in a letter to Mr. Wales, as follows :

12 Jan., 1919.

My step-mother Mrs. Bowyer-Bower asked me to write to you about the vision I had of my brother.

My brother appeared to me on the 19th March, 1917. At the time I was either sewing or talking to my baby, I cannot remember quite what I was doing at that moment. The baby was on the bed.

I had a very strong feeling I must turn round ; on doing so, I saw my brother Eldred W. Bowyer-Bower. Thinking he was alive and had been sent out to India, I was simply delighted to see him, and turned round quickly to put baby in a safe place on the bed, so that I could go on talking to my brother ; then turned again and put my hand out to him, when I found he was not there. I thought he is only joking, so I called him and looked everywhere I could think of looking. It was only when I could not find him I became very frightened and the awful fear that he might be dead. I felt very sick and giddy. I think it was 2 o'clock the baby was christened, and in the church I felt he was there, but I

could not see him. Two weeks later I saw in the paper he was missing. Yet I could not bring myself to believe he had passed away. I did fancy once I saw my grandmother, but she seemed very misty, so it may have been fancy.

I did not tell any one of the vision I saw of my brother for quite 1 or 2 months after I heard of his death, as I was staying in the Grand Hotel, Calcutta, and did not know anyone there very well. My husband was not with me and I did not write to him about it, because he did not believe in these sort of things. However, I finally told him before writing to Mrs. Bowyer-Bower. The only reason I did not mention it was, I felt nervous people would only say I had imagined it, so decided to keep quiet on the subject.

DOROTHY C. SPEARMAN.

It is unfortunate that Mrs. Spearman should not have mentioned her experience to anyone before she knew of her brother's death, but this weak point in the evidence is to some extent counteracted, because the date of the experience is established by the circumstance (clearly recollected by Mrs. Spearman) that it occurred on the day upon which her baby was christened. The christening of the child, as we are informed by Mrs. Bowyer-Bower, took place on March 19, 1917, the day of Captain Bowyer-Bower's death. It is very unlikely that Mrs. Spearman's memory would deceive her on such a point as that, and it is evident from her statements that the experience was of a striking and unusual character, the apparition being so completely developed as to make her think momentarily that her brother was actually present in the flesh. She states that the experience took place "in the latter part of the morning," which means that allowing for the difference of longitude it occurred at about the time of Captain Bowyer-Bower's death, seeing that, so far as can be ascertained, he died in France in the early morning of the same day.

2. Some visual impression of Captain Bowyer-Bower would also appear to have been received at about the time of his death by his niece, a child of not quite three years old. This incident was reported to Mr. Wales in a letter from

the child's mother, Mrs. Chater, Captain Bowyer-Bower's sister, thus :

June 5th [1918].

My mother Mrs. Bowyer-Bower tells me you wish me to write and tell you about my little girl saying she had seen my brother after he was killed.

One morning while I was still in bed, about 9.15, she came to my room and said, "Uncle Alley Boy is downstairs," and although I told her he was in France, she insisted that she had seen him. Later in the day I happened to be writing to my mother and mentioned this, not because I thought much about it, but to show that Betty still thought and spoke of her uncle of whom she was very fond. A few days afterwards we found that the date my brother was missing was the date on my letter. This letter has since been destroyed.

The child was a little under three years old at the time. . . . I have never attached much importance to this incident as it may be just only a childish lie.

CECILY CHATER.

Concerning the above letter Mrs. Bowyer-Bower wrote to Mr. Wales as follows :

8 ST. PAUL'S ROAD, BOURNEMOUTH, *12th June*, 1918.

. . . 'Alley Boy' was Eldred's pet name since he was a baby. . . .

I could not positively declare the date of Mrs. Chater's letter to me telling me what Betty saw. It might have been the 19th, 20th or 21st, but anyhow I received it down here before I got the War Office telegram announcing he was missing. Eldred fell on the Monday. The War Office telegram was received by me by post sent on from Bramham Gardens, South Kensington, my home, on Friday morning, March 23rd. . . . I *believe* I received Mrs. Chater's letter on the Wed. 21st. It was *positively* a day or two before I got the other news. In any case she told me it was on *Monday*¹ Betty tried to get her out of bed to come down and see 'Uncle Alley Boy.'

.¹ March 19, 1917, was a Monday.

It proved to be about the time the boy fell. His Colonel's account said he went out at *dawn* and after "reconnoitring just over an hour over German lines he was pounced on from the clouds by an overwhelming number of enemy machines," etc., etc. He received the news from a Cavalry Patrol between 10-11 a.m. the same day.

3. Concerning the third impression received at about the time of Captain Bowyer-Bower's death, Mrs. Bowyer-Bower wrote to Mr. Wales, thus :

June 12th, 1918.

. . . Mrs. Watson, an elderly lady I have known many years, wrote to me on the afternoon of March 19th [1917] after not corresponding with me for quite 18 months, and said she felt she must write because she felt I was in great anxiety over Eldred. (I have her two letters in store in London, fortunately.) I wrote back and said Eldred was fit and happy, and I simply took her writing thus [as an] excuse for writing again after so long. I asked her in my reply what she felt about Eldred, and she replied to this effect—on the afternoon of the day she wrote, about tea time, a certain and awful feeling came over her that he was killed, etc., etc. It was *the day* . . .

Subsequently in November, 1918, Mrs. Bowyer-Bower sent to Mr. Wales the first of the two letters written to her by Mrs. Watson, which runs as follows :

March 19, 1917.

Something tells *me* you are having great anxiety about Eldred. Will you let me know? Also have you good news of Tom? . . .

The second of Mrs. Watson's letters Mrs. Bowyer-Bower was not able to find, but her statement is sufficiently corroborated by the first letter, given above, which is dated March 19, 1917, the day of Captain Bowyer-Bower's death.

The last two experiences, that of the child and that of Mrs. Watson, are not in themselves very striking, and if either stood alone, it might be put down to chance-coincidence. But

taken together, and especially taken in conjunction with Mrs. Spearman's remarkable experience, they are not without interest, and if the agency of Captain Bowyer-Bower be assumed, they suggest that this agency was unusually powerful and was felt by more than one person.

Two later experiences, occurring after Captain Bowyer-Bower's death was known, are also worth recording. They do not fall into the same category as the three experiences related above, as indicating knowledge supernormally acquired, but they were such as greatly to impress the percipients, and again if Captain Bowyer-Bower's agency be assumed in the case of the former experiences, they suggest that this agency has continued to make itself felt since Captain Bowyer-Bower's death.

4. The percipient in one case was Mrs. Bowyer-Bower, who describes her experience thus :

June 12, 1918.

During the night, either in the late part of Nov. or early part of Dec. 1917, I came over very hot indeed and turned down the eiderdown, etc. Some few moments later I became *extraordinarily* cold with a most unnatural coldness. . . . I *doubled* the eiderdown over myself and tried to sleep and the feeling left me slightly, but came back again stronger than ever and far more intense. While I wondered what I could do a yellow-blue *ray* came right across the room and I at once blamed the housemaid (to myself) for not drawing the 'Raid' curtains together, thinking it was a light from the garage outside. I looked to make sure, but the curtains were all well together, and as I looked the ray moved right across the foot of my bed and then came round right across in front of where I lay. I watched, not at all nervously, and something like a crumpled filmy piece of chiffon unfolded and the beautiful wavy top of Eldred's head appeared, a few seconds and his forehead and broad, beautiful brow appeared, still it waited and his lovely blue eyes came, but no mischievous twinkle, but a great intensity. It all shook and quivered, then his nose came. More waiting and quivering and then his tiny little

moustache and mouth. At this point he turned his head very slightly and looked right into my face, and moistened his lips slightly with his tongue. I kept quite quiet, but it quivered and shook so much and no chin came, and in my anxiety I put out my hands and said: "*Eldred*, I see you," and it all flickered quite out, light and all. It is *possible* it might have been a dream, one never can be certain at night, but in my own mind I am satisfied it was not. The eiderdown was doubled over me in the morning when I was called, and it is not one of my habits to do things in my sleep. I certainly never slept after this, and I got slightly this cold feeling once or twice after and continued *small* rays several times during that night. Eldred referred to it through Mrs. Leonard in Jan. 1918.

F. M. B. B.

5. The percipient in the other case was Miss *Æta* Highett (Captain Bowyer-Bower's fiancée), who describes it to Mrs. Bowyer-Bower thus:

THE LODGE, HYTHE, *January 4th* [1918].

... I think I will tell you something that happened to me a short time ago. I certainly did not dream it, or imagine it, but of course it may be something to do with my brain. I was going to tell you before, only I thought you would think me mad. I heard a number of raps when I was in bed and I began to talk to Eldred, and asked him to rap twice if he was ever going to show himself to me. Almost immediately two raps came; I waited a long time but saw nothing. Then I went to sleep. Afterwards I woke up and looked round and saw Eldred on the bed beside me, he was wearing his blue suit. I sat up and started talking to him, [Miss Highett records what she said, and that "his lips started to move" and made a reply "just above a whisper"]. I then tried to touch him, but my hand went through him, and like a fool I started to cry, and he disappeared.

...

A letter from Mrs. Bowyer-Bower to Mr. Wales, written on May 30, 1918, states that "Miss Highett had her vision

in Dec. [1917] . . .” In a subsequent letter, written in reply to questions put to her by Mr. Wales, Miss Highett writes :

Saturday 15th [June, 1918].

. . . At the time of my vision I knew of the experiences of Mrs. Bower and Mrs. Watson and Mrs. Chater's child. [Miss Highett did not, however, know of the experience of Mrs. Spearman. See date of Mrs. Spearman's letter.] You wish to know what I did between my waking and seeing the vision. As a matter of fact I saw Mrs. Bower's son as soon as I woke up. After having seen the vision I switched on the electric light, which is by my bed, to look at the time and found it was four o'clock in the morning. I think you will know by this that I was perfectly awake. . . .

In a further letter to Mr. Wales Miss Highett says that when she had this vision “Captain Bower seemed to have a light all round him that made him perfectly visible.”

The last two appearances in this case were not of course phantasms of the living, but it is important to consider them in connexion with the others, for taken all together the set of experiences cannot but suggest some special capacity in the agent to manifest himself which could operate through various percipients and which continued after his bodily death.

The case suggests questions about percipency as well as about agency, for it is curious that the two persons, his mother and his fiancée, with whom one would have supposed the dying agent would most have wished to communicate, appear to have received no impressions at that time, while yet their later experiences suggest a capacity for such impressions. Do we here find support for a hypothesis, which other evidence renders plausible, that even with persons who have a capacity for receiving telepathic impressions and externalising them for their normal consciousness in the form of hallucinations or otherwise, that capacity is not always available ?

With regard to two or more percipients in different places being affected by telepathic experiences concerning

the same agent, see below, p. 265 (L. 820), a case in which a lady attacked by serious illness appears to a sister and a niece in different rooms. Compare also L. 1210 (p. 268). We may also refer to a case (L. 1130, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 58) sent by Professor Alexander of Rio de Janeiro, in which a young man dying of bubonic plague appears twice in a dream to a friend of his boyhood, while a young lady to whom he was attached hears footsteps and feels a hand-shake, which she took at the time to be his leave-taking, almost at the moment of his death. I do not quote the case, which is long, because it is not a strong one. The young lady knew of the agent's serious illness when she had her experience, and it is not quite clear whether the dreams took place within twelve hours of the death or earlier. In the *Journal*, Vol. XII., pp. 302-307, will be found a case (G. 280) of dreams and impressions concerning the same deceased person (known to be deceased) experienced by four persons within the same twelve hours or thereabouts. This is interesting in the present connexion if we may assume postmortem agency, though in that case of course it is not a case of phantasms of the living. The alternative hypothesis, that the percipients influenced each other, seems on the whole rather strained in this case.

The next case (L. 834, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 213) may be said to be a typical case of a simple apparition of the dying seen when the percipient was in bed but awake. The percipient did not allow her name to be printed, for fear of paining the relations of the friend who appeared.

(L. 834.)

July 4th, 1889.

I have noted down the remarkable incident I mentioned. The time of its occurrence was in the early part of July, 1885, between 1 and 2 in the morning. I was wide awake, not having slept at all, when all of a sudden I was startled by a bright light, and I saw at my bedside a tall figure, and distinctly recognised the face of a valued old friend who resided many miles from my home.

He was earnestly gazing at me, and on vanishing from my sight the room became dark as before. My sister, who occupied the next room, on hearing me make an exclamation, came in and found me striking a light, when I told her whom I had seen. Strange to say we received an early communication from a member of his family acquainting us that our dear old friend had passed away at the very time he appeared to me.

The narrator's sister confirms the above statement as far as her part in it is concerned.

What follows is from notes made by Mrs. Sidgwick immediately after talking over the above circumstances with the two ladies :

The gentleman who appeared was an old and intimate friend of both sisters, and corresponded constantly with them. They had not heard from him for a little while before his death, and though they knew that he was ailing they were not at all anxious, knew of no cause for special anxiety, and had not had their thoughts turned to him in any special way.

The lady who saw the apparition had not been to sleep—she is a bad sleeper—but was lying with her eyes shut trying to sleep. Suddenly she became aware of a bright light in the room and opening her eyes saw by her bedside the tall figure of her friend. The light, she told me, was like day-light and was at the side of the bed where she saw the figure. She had time to see the figure gazing earnestly at her and to notice that it was wrapped in a cloak or dressing-gown. She saw half the figure—as far down, I suppose, as the bed would let her. Apparition and light vanished together. She was startled and agitated, got out of bed and had some difficulty in finding the matches and striking a light, owing to her agitated condition.

I do not think that either sister has now an independent recollection—apart from their knowledge of the day of the death—of the *day* on which this strange experience occurred, but it made a deep impression on both, and when the letter announcing the death reached them,

which must have been within two days, they were satisfied that appearance and death were coincident. Their recollection that the appearance occurred not long after midnight is, I think, independent of subsequent information, though they are not quite sure whether it occurred between 12 and 1, or between 1 and 2.

A search for the letter announcing the death, which the percipient kindly undertook, proved fruitless, but the time of its occurrence, mentioned in the letter, "quite agreed," she writes, "with the very time I noted down of his appearance to me. This coincidence surprised and greatly impressed myself and sister."

I was shown various newspaper cuttings relating to the death and funeral, from which I copied extracts. The death is announced as having occurred on July 5th, and an obituary notice stated that the cause was general break up rather than any specific ailment. In an account of the funeral it was stated that on the coffin plate was the inscription: "Died July 6th, 1885, age 75 years." As the ladies pointed out to me, the fact that the death was announced in the newspapers as having occurred on the 5th, and on the coffin plate as on the 6th, tends strongly to show that it occurred very soon after midnight, and, therefore, confirms their recollection of its coinciding in time with the apparition.

I was told many things which showed that they were intimate friends of the gentleman who died, and that his thoughts might naturally turn to them.

The percipient assured me emphatically that she had had no other experiences of the same kind.

For the accompanying hallucinatory illumination in this case, compare the collective case (G. 241) below, p. 363.

A case which was probably a clear one of an apparition of a dying person to a waking percipient is L. 1121, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 306. I will only describe it, because we have not the account of the percipient, Mr. Phillips, who was dead when the case was sent to us by Mr. Fotheringham, an Associate of the Society. The account

we have is that of Mrs. Phillips who was cognisant of her husband's experience at the time, and is at first hand for the fact that the apparition was seen and recognised before anything was known of the death. Briefly, Mr. Phillips was at work in his shop when he saw a former lodger, Mrs. Robotham, look round the door. He was surprised not to find her outside, but felt sure at the time that he had seen Mrs. Robotham, whom he and his wife knew extremely well. A week later they learnt that she had died about that time. The account was written about three years after the event.

The following case (L. 1224, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 47) was brought to our notice by Mrs. Willett, an Associate of the Society, who wrote to us concerning it thus :

(L. 1224.)

FIR TREE END, HAYWARD'S HEATH,
SUSSEX, November 7, 1918.

I inclose an account written from dictation by the Percipient of an appearance to her of a friend who was dying at the time. Ada Orr, who is a single woman between 50 and 60, has been known to me nearly all her life. She is an absolutely truthful and straightforward person. She is quite ready to answer any questions, but particularly begs that the names of her friends shall not be made public. Mrs. B—— is a very nervous woman, and the subject of Mrs. S——'s appearance has not been mentioned to her.

MARY WILLETT.

The statement by the percipient enclosed with this letter was as follows,:

November 6, 1918.

I went to see Mrs. B—— in —— Road, on October 4, 1918,¹ [but] did not find her at home. As I came away from the house, I distinctly saw Mrs. S—— who formerly lodged with Mrs. B—— standing by the corner of the house. Just like a puff of cold air seemed to go over me. I saw exactly how she was dressed. I noticed

¹ By an error this date was first given as October 3, see below.—ED,

she was wearing her black hat with a ribbon bow at the side. Her face was quite distinct. Having seen her so distinctly as I came round the corner of the house, the next moment she had disappeared. I felt quite a creepy feeling all over me. At this time, I afterwards found Mrs. S—— was dying at the Cuckfield Infirmary—Mrs. B—— having gone to see her. She passed away at 2 a.m. the next morning. When I saw Mrs. B—— a few days later she told me about Mrs. S—— and how she had longed to go “home to die.” She said this many times, but the doctor would not agree to her being removed. Before her death Mrs. S—— had told her daughter how much she wished to see me.

[Signed] ADA ORR.

A further statement was obtained from Miss Orr, partly in reply to questions put by us, and partly by Mrs. Willett, who kindly saw Miss Orr on our behalf. According to the information thus received, Miss Orr did not mention her experience to anyone before she heard of Mrs. S——’s death, except “to an unknown woman passing by” Mrs. B——’s house at the time. The date of her visit to Mrs. B—— and of her seeing the apparition is, however, clearly fixed in her mind, as she told Mrs. Willett, by the circumstance that these events occurred on the day on which she heard of the birth of a great-niece. Mrs. Willett informs us that the child was born on October 3, 1918, and the postcard announcing the birth was received by Miss Orr on October 4, 1918. The mistake in Miss Orr’s original statement, in which the date of her visit to Mrs. B—— was given as October 3, arose doubtless through that being the date of the child’s birth by means of which she had fixed the date of her experience.

A written statement was obtained from Miss Orr on this point, thus :

December 17 [1918].

I remember the date by hearing of the birth of my niece’s Baby which I heard of by P.C. on the day that I saw Mrs. S——.

A. M. ORR.

In reply to a question as to how recently she had seen

Mrs. S—— and what she knew about her state of health, Miss Orr wrote on November 13, 1918, thus :

[I] had not seen her for at least three months when she was taken away from Mrs. B——'s to the Infirmary. I had no idea her end was near. At the time I saw her I had had a long walk and was tired, thought I would call at Mrs. B——'s for a rest, and heard afterwards she was with Mrs. S—— who was dying, which I knew nothing about.

ADA ORR.

In regard to the date of Mrs. S——'s death, independent testimony was obtained through the Curate of the Parish, who wrote thus :

December 13, 1918.

I have just found out—quite indirectly—from Mrs. B—— that Mrs. S—— died at Cuckfield Infirmary on Saturday, October 5th, at 2 a.m.

H. E. W.

It will be seen that it was not possible in this case to obtain corroborative evidence from any one to whom Miss Orr had related her experience prior to her knowledge of Mrs. S——'s death ; but her original statement was made only a month after the experience occurred, when it was still fresh in her mind, and there appears to have been nothing in the circumstances, as known to Miss Orr at the time, which would lead her to imagine that she saw Mrs. S——. Miss Orr tells us that she has never had any similar experience before, but her sister had one many years ago.

In the case just quoted the circumstances suggest the possibility that the locality had something to do with the experience—that it formed some sort of link between agent and percipient, and that the latter might not have seen the apparition had she not been close to the house where the agent had lived. The next case (L. 1087, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 41) suggests the same thing, for there seems to have been practically no link between agent and percipient except that the latter knew the former well by sight and was accustomed to see him

walking where his phantasm appeared—the place towards which she happened to be looking at the moment. A similar local connexion appears in Madame Brousiloff's experience described below, p. 210. And there is a case (L. 322, *Journal*, Vol. III., p. 254) which does not belong to our collection, as it is published in Podmore's book, where Captain Campbell is awakened from sleep by a "vivid and remarkable dream or vision" of Major Hubbersty falling forward as if dying on the night on which he actually died. The two gentlemen had not seen much of each other and were not particularly friendly; but Captain Campbell was sleeping in a room which Major Hubbersty used to occupy when stationed at the same barracks several years previously.

(L. 1087.)

We are indebted to the kindness of Mrs. Benecke for the following account of the apparition of her son who was killed while climbing in the Alps.

Her son, Mr. E. F. M. Benecke, was an Exhibitioner of Balliol College, Oxford, and, as his posthumous work on "The Position of Women in Greek Poetry" shows, a classical scholar of the highest promise. He was a good Alpine climber, and was collaborating in a guide to the Swiss Alps at the time of his death. On the day on which it occurred, he was seen in Mrs. Benecke's garden by the daughter of her laundress.

The percipient writes to Mrs. Benecke :

80, MAYES-ROAD, WOOD GREEN,
February 1st, 1897.

Madam,—Mother has this morning brought your letter to Emma over to me, as I could better write what happened on July 16th, 1895, as it was me that saw Mr. Edward with another gentleman in the garden (as I thought). I remember it all so well that I have been able to write it just as it happened.—Yours respectfully,

E. NICHOLS.

[P.S.]—I have signed the other paper with my name as it was then.

On Tuesday, July 16th, 1895, between the hours of 1 and 2 o'clock, I was doing some work in our bedroom and, looking out of the window, saw (as I thought) Mr. Edward Benecke with another young gentleman walking in the garden, and I went at once to mother and told her Mr. Edward had come home, and she said something must have prevented him from starting, as we knew he was going to Switzerland for his holiday, for I was positive it was him I saw. When nurse came in on the Thursday, mother asked her if Mr. Edward had come home, and she said "No" and then we only said "I thought I saw him," and we thought no more about it until the sad news reached us.

ELLEN CARTER.

In answer to some questions from Mrs. Benecke, Mrs. Nichols writes further :

80, MAYES-ROAD, WOOD GREEN,
February 4th, 1897.

Madam,—I am glad to be able to answer the questions you have asked me. I did see another young man with Mr. Edward (as I thought it was) and the look was not momentary, for I was so surprised to see him that I watched him until he turned round the path; he was coming, as he sometimes did after luncheon, from the stable yard, along the path and turned towards the house. He was smiling and talking to his friend, and I particularly noticed his hair, which was wavy as it always was; he had nothing on his head. It was all that that made me feel so sure it was him, and I felt that I could not have been mistaken, knowing him so well. I cannot tell you anything [about] what the other young gentleman was like, as he was walking the other side; also I hardly noticed him at all, being so surprised to see Mr. Edward. Mother was doubtful when I told her about it and said I must be mistaken; but I said I was sure I was not, and I was positive I had seen him, and I felt sure he had come home until nurse came in and said he had not been home, and then I thought how strange it was, and even then I could not think I was so mistaken, and often have I thought about it and feel even now that it

was him I saw. Mother did say perhaps some accident had happened to his friend that he was to travel with and so was prevented from going; that was the only remark that was made about an accident.

If there is any other question I can answer, I shall be only too glad to do it for you. E. NICHOLS.

Mrs. Benecke gives the following particulars :

Teddy was in the habit of walking regularly in the garden, from 10 minutes past 12 till 1 o'clock, and again directly after luncheon, varying, according to the time this meal took us, from 1.30 or 1.45 till 2.30. He was so regular that I could tell the time by his footfall on the stairs. He never, except in the very coldest weather—to please me—wore a hat or cap in the garden. The laundress often watched him walking up and down the garden paths, noticing the wind playing with his wavy hair. She even, at times, would get up on a stool to watch him, especially when Margaret was with him. She says they looked so bright and happy together. She has left us owing to her health, and her daughter married quite lately.

Teddy was devoted to his "dear mountains," they were a "second home" to him; but all his letters prove that his thoughts were very much with us on the climbs. He wrote to me in 1892 that when bivouacking out even in his Bietschhorn, "it felt strange to be so far away, so high up, and as I wrapped myself in my rug, I thought of you all, sitting round the lamp, etc." In 1895 he wrote, after his successful crossing the Wetterlücke, (a climb he was quite delighted with) "at 8.30,—just as you were coming down to breakfast, I was thinking—we were through." The last climb he wrote about to both Margaret and myself he said: "The last half-hour was not pleasant; it was the only time during the climb that I was *not* sorry you (Margaret) were not with us." With a heart so full of thought and love of us at home, even when intensely interested and occupied in his dearest pursuit, it seems natural that when called to leave us once more, he should have turned towards us and sent his

loving thoughts home. That they took his shape and were seen once more on his familiar path seems very wonderful and of course inexplicable, but to me seems a fact. I believe that he was taken when his form appeared here. It makes it somewhat more difficult to conjecture where it happened, as he intended to be back by 4 and this time—between 1 and 2—gives therefore only 3 hours from Ried.

I wrote to our former laundress with respect to her having seen Teddy on July 16th, 1895. Our old nurse told me that it was the younger daughter, Emma, who had seen him. I could not, at the time Mrs. Carter left our service, November, 1895, trust myself to speak to her about it; therefore I was rather uncertain as to what really had been said, and when I received the first letter, I wrote for a few more particulars.

It was through this letter that I heard, for the first time, that Ellen Carter saw *two* forms, which seems all the more remarkable to me. I therefore wondered if she could remember the face of the friend. I had understood she had seen him "about one o'clock" and had thought it was in his morning walk, but Ellen is positive that it was later. His coming out of the stable yard is quite likely; he often fetched the dog. I asked her if it was a "momentary passing view" she had, as in the first letter she writes almost as if she had merely looked out and then gone to her mother.

When I heard this talked about, I remembered the word "accident" and asked her if it was mentioned. Her answer in [the second] letter refers to this question.

In answer to our further enquiries, Mrs. Benecke wrote:


NORFOLK LODGE, BARNET, *February 15th*, 1897.

I will do my best to answer your questions and to do it clearly and systematically.

Ellen Carter lived with her mother and sister in a cottage in our garden. I have tried to give you an idea of the cottage by [a sketch not reproduced¹]. I took this sketch from our dining-room window, past which the broad path

[¹ But see plan on opposite page.]

leads, which I called A. Along this path my son went daily and often have I watched his light swinging steps till he had gone through the little gate I called B. This leads into our kitchen garden. I had understood that when Ellen saw him on July 16th, 1895, he was coming back from his first walk through the gate B and had turned towards our house down the path A. You will easily understand that during the first months, I could not ask questions about the events of that day,—nor, in fact, can I now. But I was told of Ellen having seen



I. Window in cottage.

C. Path leading to stables.

my son almost directly after my return, and Mr. Benecke heard of it at once. I will return to this directly. Ellen was in her mother's house tidying their bedroom (which has the window I have marked I), when, looking up, she saw my son. She tells about that herself and that he "was coming out of the stable yard." That would not be quite his usual direction, because he mostly jumped out of the window after luncheon, but still it did happen that he would fetch the dog, or put him away, in the yard. The door leading into the yard is behind bushes and he would, according to Ellen's account, have come from there and out where the path D comes out towards

our house. You will, I hope, understand from this about the distance from the cottage to the path, and that it would be quite easy for Ellen, who seems to have quite good sight, to have seen him distinctly and for a minute at least.

Mrs. Carter cannot write, so it would only be what Ellen wrote for her which we should get by asking for her version. Our old nurse, who can write, is very confused about what and when she first heard of it, and therefore she can write down nothing. I have asked her several times about it all, but she varies each time in her statements, except that she remembers Mrs. Carter asking her if "Mr. Teddy had come home," and then her saying "Oh, I told Nellie she was mistaken, when she thought she saw him." She could not have spoken like that if the conversation had taken place *after* we heard the terrible news. Mr. Benecke remembers that the gardeners told him, after the news, that Ellen had said she had seen Mr. Teddy, and the general impression has certainly been that she had said so, and therefore had believed it, that she had seen him in the garden, on that day. [She is convinced] that it was "Mr. Teddy, no one else" she saw, for she said that she knew his pretty wavy hair too well to make a mistake, and she quite sulked when it was *proved* to her that she was mistaken.

We heard the terrible news on Saturday morning, July 20th, and I started five minutes later to catch the train and go over to Switzerland. Of course the servants heard of it at once, and Nellie then is said to have been very much startled when she heard it. There has never been any doubt in our minds here that she had all along said she had seen him on the Tuesday.

There have been printed notices of my dear boy's loss in many papers. We have no means of fixing the hour of it. All we know of his plans for July 16th was that he started with Mr. Cohen at 3 a.m. from Ried, and was seen at 3.30 a.m. at Blatten, and that he had arranged with the guides of Ried to meet him there at 4 p.m. o'clock on the Tuesday, 16th, to settle details for a tour on the 17th. My son was very accurate and always

planned his tours exactly before starting. The guides told me that he knew every inch of ground in the neighbourhood. He was working for Mr. Coolidge and there was but one ridge of rock not yet explored in the district assigned to him. I feel certain that the two friends started for that ridge "Feenkündl" and that there they are now resting. This conviction has gradually become clear to me, but since I have understood the whole question, the weather has made all search impossible. . . .

MARIE BENECKE.

Mrs. Benecke also sent us the accompanying ground plan (not drawn to scale) lettered as in her sketch, showing the position of the percipient in relation to the place where the apparition was seen.

The seeing of a second figure with a realistic recognised apparition is rare, but there are other examples. The subject is discussed in Gurney's book, Chapter XII., § 6, in connexion with the case he numbers 202.

There is an old case, quite typical (L. 947, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 9), namely, the appearance of Sir T. F. Buxton's gamekeeper, Curtis, to his brother at the time of his death through an accident in 1834. It was looked into at the time, and recorded by Sir T. F. Buxton the day after it happened. The account in the *Journal* is printed from what purports to be a copy of the original record. I think it is unnecessary to quote it here.

The next case (L. 1204, *Journal*, Vol. XVII., p. 204) is peculiar in that the percipient was ill, had been at times delirious, and may have been so at the moment of the apparition. The dream-like character of the earlier part of her experience does not look as if she was in an ordinary waking condition, though the later part seems to have been like a waking hallucination and unlike her delirious imaginings. There is, of course, no reason why a telepathic hallucination should not occur during illness or delirium, and coincidence in time between this experience and the death seems to have been very close.

(L. 1204.)

The case was first brought to our notice by a paragraph in the daily press on June 6, 1916, in which it was stated that :

The sister of Seaman George William Malpress, of Peterborough, one of the men who went down with the *Queen Mary*, had a realistic dream last Wednesday [the day the *Queen Mary* was lost]. She was lying ill in bed when she thought that her brother came to her bedside, and although she spoke to him repeatedly he would not answer. He appeared quite well and happy.

Subsequently, in reply to enquiries, we received the following account from the percipient, Mrs. Baxter :

56, NEW RD., PETERBORO', June 19, 1916.

. . . in reference to my dream—as it was published in the papers, but it was not a dream, it was a vision. I was very ill at the time. It was the afternoon of the day of the battle that I saw my brother. I was taken worse and thought I was going to die. I was with my brother on his ship and he was so happy and singing, and then it changed and he was at home on leave. I thought I repeatedly spoke to him each time but he did not speak to me. I knew I was ill, and thought he would not speak because I was disfigured. I asked my mother if he had gone back and she said he had not been home. I said I knew he had, it seemed so real. I was very much upset because he would not speak to me. I did not hear of the sinking of the *Queen Mary* until a week after, as I was too ill for my mother to tell me. . . . It would be just about the time when the ship went down that I saw my brother, as it was late in the afternoon on Wednesday, May 31.

F. BAXTER.

On June 29, 1916, the Secretary of the Society, Miss Newton, went to Peterborough and called upon Mrs. Baxter and her mother, Mrs. Malpress, who kindly answered all the questions she put to them. Their evidence, as noted and summarised by

Miss Newton at the time, and confirmed by their signatures, was as follows :

On May 31 Mrs. Baxter was suffering from erysipelas, and had been ill from the previous Friday. About 5 o'clock in the afternoon she "felt something snap inside her, and part of herself seemed to have gone out of her; she thought she was dying." Then she seemed to be on a ship, or very near it; she could see the sailors moving about, and heard them singing; they were very happy. She spoke to her brother on the ship; he wouldn't answer. She called for a scarf he had given her, so that she could hide her face, as she was disfigured. Then the scene changed, she was at home, her brother was at home, she spoke to him, but he wouldn't answer. She cried, thinking it was because she was disfigured. The vision went. She was still very upset because he wouldn't speak to her. She asked her mother if her brother had gone back.

She had never had a vision, or a dream, of this kind before.

(Signed) FLORENCE ETHEL BAXTER.

June 29, 1916.

Mrs. Malpress said that her daughter had been "lightheaded on and off" during her illness, but that at the time of the vision she seemed "listless and blank." She continued :

When she had this kind of blank feeling come over her, I went down to find some one to fetch the doctor as I thought she was dying. When I went up again she was crying, and seemed very upset. I asked her what was the matter. She said Will had been to see her, and he wouldn't speak to her. The following morning I said, "How did Will look?" "Just as usual," she said; "I thought he was here home on leave. He was in his uniform, and very bright and happy."

(Signed) HANNAH MALPRESS.

June 29, 1916.

The news of the Battle of Jutland, including the announcement of the loss of H.M.S. *Queen Mary* was published on Saturday morning, June 3, 1916. In the casualty list, which appeared

a few days later (our reference is the *Daily Telegraph*, June 8) the name of G. W. Malpress, A.B., was included in the crew of the *Queen Mary*.

It is stated in Admiral Sir John Jellicoe's despatch on the battle, published in the press, July 7, 1916, that the action began at 3.48 p.m. (Greenwich mean time) on May 31; and in the various reports by observers, that the *Queen Mary* sank soon afterwards. In an article in the *Daily Telegraph* on June 6, Mr. Hurd, indicating approximately, the course which the battle took, says :

Quite early in the action the *Queen Mary*, by an unfortunate mischance, or good German gunnery, was hit, and sank in a few minutes. . . . It should be emphasised that this misfortune occurred almost immediately after the action opened.

Thus, it will be observed that the coincidence in time between the hallucination, which occurred about 5 p.m., summer time, and the death of Seaman G. W. Malpress, which occurred soon after 4.48, summer time, was very close.

It is chiefly owing to this coincidence in time that we print the case, contrary to our practice of excluding hallucinations occurring during illness where delirium is present. The evidence is further strengthened by the following considerations : (1) the hallucination seems to have been the only one which assumed definite form during the illness ; (2) it was certainly the only one described by the percipient during this time ; and (3) it was unique in her experience.

These points will be apparent from the evidence on the medical aspect of the case, kindly contributed, in answer to our enquiries, by Dr. H. Latham, of Peterborough, who was attending the percipient. The questions which were put to him are given below in square brackets :

July 3, 1916.

[How long was the percipient delirious, and was the delirium intermittent ?]

From Monday night, May 29, until the end of the week. Yes ; she appeared to ramble and say " queer things " (the mother's report to me) only at night. In the morning

or afternoon when I saw her she seemed clear in her mind.

[Was this particular hallucination described to you before the news of the Naval Battle on May 31 was known to the public ?]

I cannot fix the day, but I can say positively that I was told of it, both by Mrs. Malpress and Mrs. Baxter, long before the latter had any information of the Naval Battle or the death of young Malpress. Mrs. Baxter did not know anything about the Naval Battle, etc., until a full week after it had occurred, as I gave strict orders that she was not to be told. About a week after the Battle, say Wednesday, June 7, she picked up a paper within her reach and saw the list of officers or men on the *Queen Mary*. It was many days before this that I was informed of the vision, both by the mother and Mrs. Baxter.

Later, Dr. Latham wrote as follows :

July 15, 1916.

My distinct impression is that the hallucination was mentioned to Mrs. Malpress before the Naval Battle was known of. But I really cannot fix the date when it was told to me. All I can say is that, when I was told of the hallucination, I questioned Mrs. Baxter, and she told me quite simply that she had seen her brother on the deck of his ship, that he looked quite as usual, but never spoke a word. She told me this many days before she knew of the Battle, but I cannot fix the date.

[Were any other hallucinations described to you during the illness ? And have you heard of any experiences of the same kind that Mrs. Baxter ever had ?]

No, only that she said such "queer things."

I am quite sure that neither Mrs. Malpress nor Mrs. Baxter have ever had any other previous experience of the kind. They took no interest in the subject when I was first informed of it, which was early, and long before anything appeared in the papers.

(Signed) H. LATHAM, M.B. (Edin.), etc.

Another unusual case is (L. 1159, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 103) one peculiarity being that the experience was in part collective. The apparition, if it was one, was seen out of doors and among other people first by one percipient, and again, a few minutes later and in another position, by him and a friend together. There was nothing at the time to suggest to them that they had not seen a real man—no disappearance for instance. They saw him among other people in places where he might naturally have been and left him there, and only suspected anything mysterious when they learnt some hours later that the man they thought they had seen had not been there, he having in fact been drowned the night before. In this case the collectivity alone would have been interesting, but there are so many other unusual features—the repetition of the apparition and in a different form after the percipient had gone away and returned; the persistence of the second appearance to both percipients; the total absence of anything suggesting a hallucination—that in spite of difficulties I feel almost certain that there was either a mistake of identity or a confusion of dates; therefore, as it is a long case, I do not quote it here.

So far the apparitions occurring at the time of the death of the person seen which have been quoted have all been realistic; in appearance, position, and movement, when movement occurred, they have been like real people, and in most instances have at the moment been mistaken for such. The dress and aspect of the apparition have, moreover, been appropriate to the situation in which it was seen, and, with the possible exception of L. 1146 (p. 160), have conveyed no information as to that in which the agent actually was. I will now quote two dreams which have the same characteristics, though with the addition of the dramatisation, which, as remarked above (p. 29), is so common in dreams.

The first of the two dreams (L. 1179, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 295) was sent to us by Major-General Carey, who carefully examined the witnesses and obtained their statements.

(L. 1179.)

The dreamer's account is as follows :

30 ARCHERS ROAD,
SOUTHAMPTON, *April 14th*, 1910.

I, Charlotte Cox, am in the service of Miss Lydia Le Cocq, who resides at No 30 Archers Road, Southampton. (I have been upwards of 38 years in her service and in that of her cousin, Mrs. Laurence, who died in 1889.) My mistress being in poor health, I am accustomed to sleep in her room.

On Sunday, 19th December, 1909, at about 7 a.m., I had a vivid dream. I thought I saw an old friend of mine standing in the doorway (half-open) between the bed-room and the landing. I said in my dream, "O here is Susan." She appeared to be dressed in her bonnet and mantle, looking quite natural, like herself as I recollect her, though I had not seen her for some years. Miss Le Cocq, I thought, turned round with a smile to welcome her, she being an old acquaintance, having lived for upwards of 50 years in the family, with Dr. Le Cocq, Miss Le Cocq's uncle, and Mrs. Barnes, his daughter, both now deceased. She had married a Mr. Thomas Brailey about 20 years ago, being then upwards of 60 years of age, and lived with him in Guernsey till his death about three years ago, afterwards in Jersey.

The dream was a short one, and I awoke at about my usual hour in the winter, 7 a.m.

I mentioned the fact of having had the dream that morning, both to Miss Le Cocq, and also to my fellow-servant, Lilian Allmeritter, who too has been 17½ years with Miss Le Cocq.

On the next evening, Monday, 20th December, 1909, I received a notice from Messrs. Croad & Sons, Undertakers in Jersey (attached hereto), dated 19th December, 1909 (Post-mark Jersey, 11.45 p.m. Dec. 19, '09) to the effect that Mrs. Thomas Brailey had died on that day at The Birches, St. Saviour's, Jersey.

A few days after I also received a letter from a friend in Jersey, who mentioned the hour of the death, viz.

7 a.m.—thus coinciding with the time when I awoke from my dream here. I was not aware at that time of Mrs. Brailey being ill, nor had any reason before my dream for being anxious about her. I had never dreamt of her before, nor have I had any other experience of a similar character at the time of the death of any other friend of mine.

CHARLOTTE COX.

Miss Allmeritter writes :

April 14th, 1910.

I am in Miss Le Cocq's service. I recollect Charlotte Cox, at breakfast on the 19th December, 1909, telling me of her dream about her old friend, Mrs. Brailey, as described above. The notice from the Jersey undertakers came by post the next evening.

LILIAN ALLMERITTER.

The second dream is the following (L. 1147, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 99). It was obtained for us by Mr. F. J. M. Stratton, of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and most of the confirmatory evidence was collected by his efforts. The percipient, Mrs. Mann, writes as follows :

(L. 1147.)

KING'S FIELD, CAMBRIDGE, *February 11th, 1904.*

On the night of Friday, January 22nd, 1904, I had a vivid dream.

I saw my old friend, Dr. X., who left Cambridge about 10 years ago, and I had not seen him since, sitting by my side. He took hold of my hand saying, "Why have you not been to see me?" I said, "Oh! I've been so busy that I've not been able to get away. You are so altered since I saw you last." "Yes," he said, "but that is so long ago." He then disappeared. The dream so impressed me that I told it to my husband at breakfast the next morning, Saturday 23rd, and also to a friend who knew the doctor on the 25th.

On Saturday morning, the 30th, my husband at breakfast said he had received a memorial notice of Dr. X.'s

death, which took place on the 23rd instant, the day after my dream.

S. MANN.

A. H. MANN.

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :

February 19th, 1904.

I called on Mrs. Mann this afternoon and she kindly talked very fully about her experience. It was distinctly a dream, but a very vivid and realistic one. It was brought to an end by her awaking. In the dream she and Dr. X. seemed to be sitting on a sofa—it might have been the one in her drawing room—and they talked just as they used to do, his voice and manner unchanged. He had been her medical attendant . . . ; but he gave up his practice and retired some 10 years ago, leaving Cambridge, and she had not seen him since, though her husband had. . . . In the dream his hair and whiskers, which had been dark iron grey when Mrs. Mann last saw him, were white. There had been no mention of Dr. X. in conversation, nor had Mrs. Mann been thinking of him, and she knows of nothing which would have been likely to suggest the dream. She is quite sure that the dream occurred on the night of Friday, January 22nd, and I think her recollection of this is independent of her knowledge of the date of the death, though she has nothing very definite to remember it by. She told it on Saturday morning to Dr. Mann and in the course of the day to Miss C——. It was Miss C—— who on February 11th wrote out the account of it, which Dr. and Mrs. Mann signed. On Monday, January 25th, Mrs. Mann told the dream to Miss T——, and she has promised to ask her to write an independent account. She showed me the memorial notice of Dr. X.'s death on January 23rd. This reached Dr. Mann on January 30th, as is shown by the post-mark. Mrs. Mann does not remember having had any other vivid and realistic dream that impressed her as this one did, nor any that made an impression which she felt it worth while to mention next day. She has, however, had presentiments; one of them was of her father's illness and death a few days before he

died suddenly. She once saw what seemed to be an apparition—late one evening last summer [of a relative who had lately died].

ELEANOR MILDRED SIDGWICK.

The above account was sent to Mrs. Mann and returned by her to Mrs. Sidgwick with the statement that she thought everything in it correct.

Mr. Stratton writes :

December 4th, 1904.

The friend [Miss T——] to whom Mrs. Mann mentioned her dream, was unfortunately, through absence from England, not approached for her account of the case until a considerable interval had elapsed. As she was then unwilling to make any statement on the matter, I may perhaps be allowed to mention that I had a short conversation with her several weeks after the event; and that she then spoke of Mrs. Mann's dream as curious, and showed that she was at that time ignorant of the doctor's death. Unfortunately the conversation was interrupted before I had an opportunity of asking for her corroborative evidence.

I have also seen a pencil note that Dr. Mann made in his diary under the date Saturday, "January 23rd : X. [full surname given] Dream."

I heard of this note at the first, but could not manage to see it till some six months later the old monthly diary, in which it was written, was looked out for me to see.

F. J. M. STRATTON.

Dr. X.'s son wrote to Mrs. Sidgwick as follows :

January 13th, 1905.

. . . My father died on January 23rd, 1904, at about 4.30 a.m. Though he had been an invalid for some years, his death was not expected till a seizure 5 days before his death. During most of those 5 days he was unconscious, and was quite so for the last 36 hours or so before he passed away. His hair was by no means white, though tinged with white—his whiskers were very considerably white, though not quite. . . .

To these we may add the following interesting and vivid dream (L. 1220, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 3), since in the absence of proof that the costume seen was that actually worn, we cannot claim this as a "veridical adjunct" (see below). The case was first brought to our notice by Miss H. E. Macklin, who had been an Associate of the Society for some years, in the following letter :

(L. 1220.)

June 26, 1918.

My nephew, 2nd Lieut. David Macklin, was killed near Albert, March 27th [1918], his mother receiving the news from the War Office on April 3. On the night March 27-28 (within a few hours of his death), she saw him (whether in sleep or not is doubtful), and believed it to be an intimation of his death. She made no written record at the time, but spoke of it that day to her sister and her servant.

It is an interesting point that she saw him dressed in a way which surprised and puzzled her, but which seems to have been correct. We could probably make certain.

HELEN E. MACKLIN.

On July 2, 1918, Miss Macklin called at the S.P.R. Rooms and gave the Secretary further particulars in regard to the case and kindly expressed her willingness to collect the necessary evidence.

A statement from the percipient, Mrs. Macklin, was received a few days later, as follows :

WHITE WOOD CORNER, SANDY.

July 5, 1918.

My sister-in-law has asked me to write to you about an impression I had of my son coming to me about the time of his death.

I did not make any note of it at the time, but I know the date, because I spoke of my impression next day to a sister who came to visit me that day and to a servant who came home the same afternoon, March 28th.

When the German offensive began on March 21st, I was anxious about my son, because he was (2nd Lieut. in the 4th Bedfordshire), as I believed, somewhere in the neighbourhood of Arras.

On the night of the 27th March or in the early hours of the 28th (I don't know the time), I had what I can only describe as a waking dream. I mean that it did not seem just an ordinary dream to me.

When I got up on the Thursday morning it was so vivid that it haunted me, and I spoke of it, as I said, on that day.

It seemed that I felt or heard footsteps along the verandah outside my bedroom window (I live in a bungalow), and that I rushed out knowing the steps were my boy's. (Bodily I did not leave my bed.)

I seemed to see him with a "tin hat" and his pack with webbing equipment, and my general feeling was great dismay that he should be in "Tommy's kit," and I exclaimed, "Oh, David boy, you have never disgraced your officer's uniform and had to go back to Tommy's clothes."

(I am rather troubled at repeating this, because it almost seems to imply that I had doubts of my boy, which I certainly had not. He was a very dear son and brother, and had got on splendidly as Intelligence officer; he was a most happy and very keen soldier, and letters from his senior officers and men testify to his efficiency and courage, as well as to his thoroughly good and useful work.)

He passed as in a flash and I can't say that he looked at me, it was more a feeling of knowing he was there. From that time I expected bad news of him and I was not surprised to get a telegram from the W.O. on the 3rd April, to tell me that my son had been killed in action on March the 27th.

I think that the dream or impression, whichever it was, haunted me all the more, because on the last evening of my son's leave before he returned to France on Jan. 31, I was helping him to pack, and naturally there was one thought uppermost, though we were both quite cheerful.

I said to him, "If what we can't help thinking about should happen, will you try to come to me?"

He did not say anything, but he would always try to do anything he could that I asked him, and I believe if it were in his power that he would have willed to come to me at the time of his death.

On Friday, April 5th, two of my other sons came home. I was talking to them about my impression of their brother's coming to me and my trouble that he should be wearing Tommy's clothes. And they both said, "That is how he would have seemed to you."

I think that is all I can tell you, and it does not seem very much, but my sister-in-law asked me to write.

MARIAN M. MACKLIN.

After making this statement Mrs. Macklin wrote to her sister and to the servant to whom she had mentioned her experience before it was verified to obtain their corroboration. We quote her letters below to show that her enquiries were couched in quite general terms.

Letter from Mrs. Macklin to Lizzie Reynolds.

Do you remember when you came home for Easter, my telling you about a sort of dream I had had about Master David? I have been asked if you would mind writing down what you remember of what I told you.

If you don't remember, never mind, but if you do remember anything, just state what you can. Give your reason for remembering the date.

To this letter Mrs. Macklin received the following reply:

August 13, 1918.

Mrs. Macklin has asked me to write what I remember concerning the dream she had of her son, Mr. David Macklin. On March 28th Mrs. Macklin related to me, how during some period of the night of March 27th she saw in a dream Mr. David running along the verandah in his tin helmet and private's uniform, when she exclaimed: "Oh, David, what have you done to disgrace

yourself?" The following Wednesday [April 3] Mrs. Macklin received a telegram stating her son had been killed in action on Wed., March 27th. L. REYNOLDS.

P.S.—I am quite certain it was March 28th Mrs. Macklin spoke to me of her dream, as I had been away several weeks, and returned home on that date to spend Easter.

Letter from Mrs. Macklin to Miss Bridgman.

I have been asked if you would write an account of what you remember of my telling you about my impression or dream, or whatever it may have been, of dear David on the day that you came to White Wood Corner in March. Possibly you may not remember anything. I don't want to remind you of any details or give you leads. But if you can write anything clearly, I want to send it to the S.P.R.

Miss Bridgman replied to this letter as follows:¹

4, ST. STEPHEN'S ROAD, BAYSWATER, W. 2.

"I have been asked by my sister, Mrs. Macklin, to write what I can remember of what she told me of her dream or vision on the 27th-28th March this year.

I can state that these were her words as nearly as possible :

'I have a queer feeling about my David this morning. Last night I saw him so clearly, he seemed to come suddenly round the corner of the verandah, rushing, and in a great hurry dashed past me. He seemed to be dressed in an ordinary Tommy's uniform, with "tin helmet." I said, "Oh, David, you have done nothing to disgrace your uniform as an officer." He did not reply, but disappeared to the right of the front of the bungalow.'

I went to visit my sister on Thursday, March 28th, and it was the day I arrived that she told me of her dream.

H. M. BRIDGMAN.

¹ Miss Bridgman's statement, which is not dated, was written in August, 1918, but by an oversight was not sent to the S.P.R. until November.

In reply to a further enquiry Mrs. Macklin informed us that she had never had a similar impression or any other experience of psychical interest that she could recall.

With regard to Mrs. Macklin's impression that her son was in a private soldier's uniform, Lieut. Macklin's body was never recovered, and since many of those with him have been killed it has not been possible to obtain definite information on the point. But it is [we understand] a common thing for officers when they go into action to be so equipped as to be almost indistinguishable from private soldiers.

We are indebted to Mrs. and Miss Macklin for permission to use names.

Death Coincidences—(b) not realistic.

In the case just quoted there had been a request to the agent by the percipient to appear if possible. In the two I will next give there had apparently been a promise to try to communicate. In these two and also in the two that follow them apparitions were seen by waking percipients, but they were not realistic. Though fully recognised they were not, and hardly could have been, mistaken even momentarily for real men. In the first (L. 977, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 368), from Prince Victor Duleep Singh, the experience seems to have been almost on the line between illusion and hallucination.

(L. 977.)

HIGHCLERE CASTLE, NEWBURY, *November 8th, 1894.*

On Saturday, October, 1893, I was in Berlin with Lord Carnarvon. We went to a theatre together and returned before midnight. I went to bed, leaving, as I always do, a bright light in the room (electric light). As I lay in bed I found myself looking at an oleograph which hung on the wall opposite my bed. I saw distinctly the face of my father, the Maharajah Duleep Singh, looking at me, as it were out of this picture; not like a portrait of him, but his real head. The head about filled the picture frame. I continued looking and still saw my father looking at me with an intent expression.

Though not in the least alarmed, I was so puzzled that I got out of bed to see what the picture really was. It was an oleograph common-place picture of a girl holding a rose and leaning out of a balcony, an arch forming a background. The girl's face was quite small, whereas my father's head was the size of life and filled the frame.

I was in no special anxiety about my father at the time, and had for some years known him to be seriously out of health; but there had been no news to alarm me about him.

Next morning (Sunday) I told the incident to Lord Carnarvon.

That evening (Sunday) late on returning home, Lord Carnarvon brought two telegrams into my room and handed them to me. I said at once, "My father is dead." That was the fact. He had had an apoplectic seizure on the Saturday evening at about nine o'clock, from which he never recovered, but continued unconscious and died on the Sunday, early in the afternoon. My father had often said to me that if I was not with him when he died he would try and come to me.

I am not subject to hallucinations, and have only once had any similar experience, when, as a schoolboy, I fancied I saw the figure of a dead schoolboy who had died in the room which I slept in with my brother; but I attach no importance to this.

VICTOR DULEEP SINGH.

Lord Carnarvon writes :

I can confirm Prince V. Duleep Singh's account. I heard the incident from him on the Sunday morning. The same evening, at about 12 p.m., he received a telegram notifying him of his father's sudden illness and death. We had no knowledge of his father's illness. He has never told me of any similar previous occurrence.

CARNARVON.

We have ascertained that the Maharajah Duleep Singh died on Sunday, October 22nd, 1893.

The next case (L. 974, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 280) was sent to us by Mrs. Scott, The Elms, Acton Hill, London, W., in a letter dated November 25, 1893. Of the two apparitions described, the first is beyond our time-limit of five years between event and record, and the exactness of the coincidence is doubtful, but it is interesting that the percipient should have had two experiences of the kind. Mrs. Scott writes :

(L. 974.)

A sister of mine went to South America, and married there. One morning I was in bed about 11 o'clock, when there was a knock at my door ; thinking it was the house-maid with hot water, I said "Come in." No one came in. There was another knock ; again I said "Come in," and turned towards the door. My sister was standing there. I, thinking she had returned unexpectedly, said "What, *you*, Elsie ?" She then vanished. When I went downstairs I told my husband, who said, "Don't tell your mother, or she will think something has happened to her." We heard a month later that she had died, after a few hours' illness, about that time.

On December the 6th, 1892, I returned home about 11.30, after spending the evening with some friends. On going upstairs, I saw a tall man so close to me that I put out my hand to push him back, but my hand went into space. I again moved forward, when he was close in front of me, and, though I couldn't see his face, I recognised the figure of a great friend of mine in India. I went into my sitting-room, almost expecting to find him there. A week later I got the news of his death at Bombay, on the evening of the 6th. He had always said that if anything happened to him, he would let me know. I may add I wrote to an old ship-mate of his, and told him of my experience, on the morning of the 7th.

In reply to our request for corroborative testimony, Mrs. Scott wrote :

November 29th, 1893.

I enclose a few lines from my sister and my husband. The man I wrote to about having seen Percy Faulkner,

was Lieut. Edward Reeves, R.N., of H.M.S. *Royalist*, at present on the Australian station. I can, if you wish it, write and ask if he still has my letter, or ask him to write you a few lines, but it will be three months before an answer can be received.

I cannot be *sure* of the date in March 1887, that I saw my sister, but I *believe* it to have been at the actual time of her death, which was on the 15th of March. We did not receive the news till more than a month after.

The notes enclosed were the following :

THE ELMS, ACTON HILL, W., *November 29, 1893.*

I well remember, in March 1887, my wife telling me she had seen her sister, who was then in South America. I advised her not to tell her mother, in case it should upset her.

RONALD A. SCOTT,
M.R.I., F.R.G.S., M.I.E.E., &c.

WOODLAND COTTAGE, ACTON HILL, LONDON, W.,
November 29th, 1893.

I remember my sister, Mrs. Scott, telling me on the morning of December 7th that she had seen a friend of ours, Percy Faulkner, at that time in Bombay, on the staircase the night before, and wondering what it meant.

FLORENCE FARQUHARSON.

Mrs. Scott wrote later in answer to further enquiries :

December 28th, 1893.

I am doubtful of Mr. Reeves having kept my letter about Percy Faulkner, but of course he would remember about it. It was to my sister, Miss Farquharson, that I mentioned what I had seen, not to Mr. Scott. In the case of seeing my sister, I mentioned it to him.

I had not any idea of Mr. Faulkner being ill; in fact he was not, for he died from an overdose of chloral, which he was taking for insomnia. He always said that if anything happened to him, he would let me know.

I enclose extracts from a letter I received from a shipmate of Mr. Faulkner's about his death. I am unable to send the letter, as there are some private details.

The letter was written, Mrs. Scott informs us, by J. Ham, Esq., R.N., H.M.S. *Cossack*, and the extracts sent us were as follows :

BOMBAY, *January 15th*, 1893.

The ship was placed in dock on the 5th and we were quartered at the Great Western Hotel, Percy's room being on the same flat as mine, and but four or five rooms removed. . . . On the evening of the 5th, we went for a walk and to hear the band, and talked a great deal on home affairs; he was in the best of spirits. We afterwards met friends, and I learnt afterwards that he went to the club. I went to his room the morning of the 6th and tapped at the door. He answered, and I asked him how he felt. His reply was "Not much, old chap." That was the last I saw of the poor chap alive. . . . About 10, a servant came and told me that a doctor wanted to see me. I followed the boy, and imagine my grief when I saw two doctors attempting to restore life to him who has so lately been a source of life to us all. . . . Your seeing Percy, as you relate, was very strange and most remarkable, and yet undoubtedly the same thing has happened before with those who have had dear friends dying in distant lands.

We wrote to Lieutenant Reeves, asking if he still possessed the letter in which Mrs. Scott had informed him of her experience before she heard of Mr. Faulkner's death, and he replied :

H.M.S. *Royalist*, ALBANY, WESTERN AUSTRALIA,
February 8th, 1894.

DEAR SIR,—Your letter of January 3rd to hand. With regard to any documentary evidence with reference to Mrs. Scott's writing and telling me she had seen the apparition of Mr. Percy Faulkner at the time of his death, I am afraid I have none, as the letter was destroyed, and at the same time, I at this moment don't recollect

the date, having unfortunately no diary or anything to refer back to. But at the time I was quite convinced in my mind that Mrs. Scott had seen him; for, as she tells you, she wrote to me the next morning, and I was up at Acton very shortly afterwards and questioned her most closely about it, and from what we afterwards heard about Mr. Faulkner's death, there was no flaw as regards the time. I am afraid this cannot help you at all, but it would be useless my saying more than [that], having satisfied my own mind as to what Mrs. Scott had seen, I let the matter drop. Yours very truly,

EDWARD REEVES.

In the next case (L. 979, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 7), the triple form of the apparition is a curious feature, and one which it would be difficult to explain by a mistake of identity. Mr. R. W. Raper, through whom the case reached us, writes to Mr. Myers :

(L. 979.)

TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD, *May 5th*, 1892.

The enclosed narrative was written down at my request. I heard it from the lips of the narrator, very soon after the event occurred last Christmas vacation. He has put the tale on paper for me, almost exactly as he told it me first. I know him well, and can guarantee his perfect good faith.

The account enclosed was as follows :

NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD.

Just before last Christmas I went over to Liverpool with one of my brothers and my sister. It was a very fine, clear day, and there was a great crowd of people shopping in the streets. We were walking down Lord-street, one of the principal streets, when, passing me, I saw an old uncle of mine whom I knew very little, and had not seen for a very long time, although he lived near me. I saw three distinct shapes hobbling past (he was lame) one after the other in a line. It didn't

seem to strike me at the moment as being in the least curious, not even there being three shapes in a line. I said to my sister, "I have just seen Uncle E., and I am sure he is dead." I said this as it were mechanically, and not feeling at all impressed. Of course my brother and sister laughed. We thought nothing more about it while in Liverpool. The first thing my mother said to us on getting home was, "I have some news"; then she told us that this uncle had died very early that morning. I don't know the particular hour. I saw the three shapes at about 12 in the morning. I felt perfectly fit and well, and was not thinking of my uncle in the least, nor did I know he was ill. Both my brother and my sister heard me say that I had seen him, and believed he was dead, and they were equally astonished at hearing of his death on our return home. My uncle and I knew each other very little. In fact, he hardly knew me by sight, although he knew me well when I was a small child.

J. DOVE.

In reply to our request for corroborative evidence, Mr. Dove writes :

May 20th [1892].

I enclose letters from my mother and my sister. Apparently my uncle had died in his sleep in the early morning, as he was found dead in the morning. I believe he was not ill before. I am afraid I can't remember the date of our excursion to Liverpool, but believe it to have been about two or three days before Christmas.

The following are the letters enclosed :

(1) *From Mrs. Dove.*

21, DEVONSHIRE PLACE, CLAUGHTON, BIRKENHEAD,
May 15th, 1892.

I am sorry I have not been able to find out any particulars about Uncle Edward's death. I sent the letter you enclosed with yours for Granny to read, so that she might be able to give me particulars; but she

says no one knows the hour of his death, for he was found dead in bed and had died in his sleep. . . .

A. G. DOVE.

(2) *From Miss Dove.*

May 17th [1892].

Mother said you wanted me to write to you about the Uncle Edwards episode. I do remember distinctly your saying to me in Liverpool, "three men have passed me exactly like Uncle E.: he must be dead!" and then we heard afterwards that he had died that day, but I do not remember the date.

In the next case (L. 991, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 121) the apparition seems to have been of a shadowy description, though it conveyed to the percipient the idea of a particular person.

(L. 991.)

The case came to us through Mr. A. Aksakoff, who received it from Mrs. Broussiloff. She writes :

ST. PETERSBURG, *April 19th, 1895.*

On the 16th (28th) of February of this year (1895) between 9 and 10 o'clock in the evening, I, the undersigned, was sitting in our drawing-room—the small one—facing the large drawing-room which I could see in its entire length. My husband, his brother with his wife, and my mother were also sitting in the same room with me round a large round table. I was writing down my household accounts for the day, whilst the others were carrying on some gay conversation. Having accidentally raised my head and looked into the large drawing-room, I noticed, with astonishment, that a large gray shadow had passed from the door of the dining-room to that of the ante-chamber; and it came into my head that the figure I had seen bore a striking resemblance in stature to Colonel Av¹-Meinander, an acquaintance of ours, who

¹ Particle equivalent to the German "von" (the name is a Swedish one).

had lived in this very lodging for a long time. At the first moment I wished to say at once that a ghost had just flashed before me, but stopped, as I was afraid of being laughed at by my husband's brother and his wife, and also of being scolded by my husband, who, in view of the excitement which I showed when such phenomena were taking place, tried to convince me that they were the fruit of my fancy. As I knew that Meinander was alive and well, and was commander of the "Malorossüsky" 40th regiment of dragoons, I did not say anything then; but when I was going to bed, I related to my mother what I had seen, and the next morning could not refrain from mentioning it to my husband.

Our astonishment was extreme when on the 18th of February (2nd of March) we learned that Nicholas Ottovitch Av-Meinander had actually died after a short illness on the 16th (28th) of February at 9 o'clock in the evening, in the town of Stashovo,¹ where his regiment is stationed.

ANNA NICOLAIEVNA BROUSSILOFF.

Mrs. Broussiloff's mother writes :

My daughter did actually relate to me on February 16th (28th), about midnight, when I was going to bed, about the phantom she had seen, precisely as she has described it above.

MARIE VON HAGEMEISTER.

Colonel Broussiloff writes :

ARAKTCHÉIEFF BARRACKS, ST. PETERSBURG,
April 19th, 1895.

Colonel Nicholas Ottovitch Av-Meinander and his family had formerly lived for about nine years at a time in the lodging where we live now. Both he and the members of his household liked this lodging very much, and parted with it with regret about four years ago, in consequence of his appointment as commander of the "Malorossüsky" 40th regiment of dragoons, stationed in the town of Stashovo.

¹ Government of Radom, Poland, 1,200 *versts* from Petersburg.

From time to time my wife had already seen ghosts before, which threw her into a great state of excitement. I consequently did my utmost to persuade her not to pay any attention to such phenomena and to consider them as the fruit of imagination. My wife had never seen anything supernatural for the last two years, and was inexpressibly glad of it. She is a woman of a quiet and equable character, and is not nervous generally. On the 16th (28th) of February, no one of us had any reason to be excited or to think about Meinander, as, according to information that was to hand, both he and his family were in excellent health. When my wife related to me her vision in the morning of February 17th, I laughed at her and requested her not to think about this case, which I considered to be a hallucination. The first news of Meinander's unexpected demise was received by us on February 18th, when we read in the [military] "order of the day" [appended to the original narrative in Russian] that Meinander was dead and that a funeral service for the rest of his soul was to be celebrated; and the next morning we read in the [obituary notices of the] *Novoie Vremia*, No. 6,816, that he had died on February 16th (28th), at nine o'clock in the evening.

COLONEL ALEXIS-ALEXÉIEVITCH BROUSSIOFF.

In connexion with this may be mentioned a case (L. 839, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 268) where a dark shadowy figure was seen moving across the room by Miss M. Thelemann. It was unrecognised, but some hours later the thought of a dear friend came suddenly into her mind and she afterwards learnt that the friend died at that time. As the experience was unrecorded till nearly four years after its occurrence and is uncorroborated, I do not quote it in full. Such undeveloped veridical hallucinations are, however, quite conceivable, and indeed there is reason to think that they occur. Compare Gurney's book, Chap. XII., especially case No. 196.

This concludes the cases in our collection of apparitions of dying persons seen by waking percipients. In none

of them, with the doubtful exceptions of L. 1146, p. 160, and L. 1220, p. 199, was any indication given of the circumstances or surroundings of the agents.

Death Coincidences—(c) Visual with veridical or symbolic adjuncts.

There are, however, five dreams in which the dying agent is seen and some correct information is received. The first of these (L. 978, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 368) occurred a few hours before the death. It was received through Miss E. Sturge of Chilliswood, Tyndall's Park, Bristol. The percipient, here called Miss G., gave her real name in confidence. She wrote:

(L. 978.)

April 1st, 1891.

I saw my brother, who was ill at the time, lying in his berth, dressed in his clothes. The ship was moving slowly along—it was a bright moonlight night and everything was exceedingly quiet and peaceful. At first he appeared asleep, but at length opened his eyes, gave me a bright smile and one long look and then closed them again. Apparently I saw him just a few hours before he died. As far as I can remember, it was after midnight on the 29th of December, 1886. I was in bed, and very tired, after the exertions of a children's Christmas party. Of course I was anxious about my brother, but from that time all anxiety seemed to cease. When anyone congratulated me upon the safe arrival of the vessel, it seemed to make no cheerful impression, and I ceased from that time writing the weekly letters which I had been in the habit of sending, although we did not hear of his death until February 7th, 1887. I was 22 years old at the time. I had not seen my brother since the 22nd of September, 1886, the date when the vessel left the docks.

Miss Sturge adds:

Miss G.'s brother had not been in good health, and had travelled a good deal on account of it, but the family

were not especially anxious about him at the time of his death. He was going alone to Australia and died very shortly before arrival, and it was almost by accident that the family heard of his death.

Miss Sturge writes later :

July 27th, 1891.

I find from a letter I have received from [Miss G.] that she does not quite know whether she was asleep or awake at the time of her vision, but says she is certain she was awake immediately after. She sends me the printed invitation to the children's party on the 28th December, 1886, and she sends also a copy of the letter from the wife of the captain of the ship on which her brother was at the time of his death, by which I see that he died at 10 p.m. on the 29th December, the dream or vision thus preceding the death. Miss G. repeats that she was so certain that her brother was dead that she refused to write to him or send him anything. She made no written memorandum at the time, but spoke of it to Mr. and Mrs. M. with whom she was then and is now living [as their governess].

She seems to have been in the habit of dreaming of her brother, as she was very fond of him.

Mr. Myers called on Miss G., on December 18th, 1891, and writes :

I saw Miss G. yesterday. She thinks that her experience ought to be classed as a dream, although it was more vivid than any other dream she remembers, and woke her up so thoroughly that she got up and did not sleep again for some hours.

This dream alone of all that she has had showed her brother ill and altered, as he in fact was altered before death.

She did not tell Mr. and Mrs. M. until the news had arrived. She intentionally kept the invitation card (which I saw), as a memento of the date, not wishing to put on paper what she regarded as so private a matter.

The best proof of the importance of this dream in her eyes is that she *never once wrote to her brother again*, although she was devotedly attached to him, and used to write by every, or almost every, mail. Had he been *alive*, he would have missed her letters with surprise and pain. I have seen the captain's wife's letter. The brother died at Port Adelaide between 7 and 10 p.m. on the 29th, which would be in England from 9.40 to 12.40 a.m. on the 29th. The vision therefore preceded the death by less than 12 hours.

The brother had in fact been mainly lying dressed in his berth towards the last, not being strong enough to be much on deck.

F. W. H. MYERS.

Miss G. writes to Mr. Myers on December 23rd, 1891 :

DEAR SIR,—Enclosed with this you will find the written statement of Mr. M., which you desired me to send you. I fear you will not find it very satisfactory—as, of course, to be really valuable to you, I ought to have mentioned my dream before the news of my brother's death reached England. As it is, it was quite by accident that Mr. M. found out about it. We were on the station, and he was seeing me off on my way home, and was expressing sympathy with me and saying how sorry he was, etc., when I remarked “it was stupid of me to feel it so much, as I'd known for a long time how it would be.” Then he pressed me to tell him how I knew, and I told him the facts with which you are already acquainted, and he told Mrs. M. Before giving my account to Miss Sturge, I got both Mr. and Mrs. M. to read it through, not liking to trust entirely to my own memory, and they both thought it correct.

Mr. M. corroborates as follows :

December 21st, 1891.

With reference to the particulars which have been given by Miss G. respecting the dream she had on the night of her brother's departure from this life, I perfectly recollect her telling me when the news arrived that she

had known for a long time that he had gone. She then described minutely to me the surroundings of the room, etc., on the ship where he died, and named other particulars which the written accounts I subsequently read from the wife of the captain of the vessel markedly confirmed.

I should perhaps say Miss G. is, and always has been, very averse to conversing on the subject, and I have always abstained from pressing her to do so, and from troubling her by anything like cross questions on the subject. Miss G. was deeply attached to her brother, and had seen him off on his leaving England.

The next case (L. 973, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 249) was received through the American Branch. In the first instance a second-hand account of the case was sent to Dr. Hodgson by Miss Lilian Whiting, in May, 1891. The percipient prefers that her name should not be printed.

(L. 973.)

Miss Whiting writes :

HOTEL BRUNSWICK, *May 27th*, 1891.

DEAR DR. HODGSON,—Miss—— tells me the following, and gives her permission to my relating it to you. I enclose her card.

In February last, her mother, living in N. H., died suddenly one night between nine and ten, of heart-disease. Her last words to a daughter-in-law present were : “ Don’t cry, don’t feel badly, you have done everything you could for me.”

That same night, Miss —— was here at the Brunswick, the guest of the ——, and they were out at some entertainment in the evening. They returned, and Miss —— retired about eleven and immediately had a vivid dream that her mother came to her, embraced her fervently, and said : “ Don’t cry, don’t feel badly, you have done everything you could for me.” The impression was so vivid—she felt the touch—heard the tones—that she slept little, and the next morning told Mrs. —— that she must

go and visit her mother—that she was sure she was ill and wanted her, and almost while they were talking of it, the telegram announcing her mother's death came. When Miss ——— reached the place, she told her sister-in-law the words of the dream before the sister-in-law had told her what their mother actually said, and the lady who was present with the dying woman was startled at the coincidence of the actual last words of the dream.

Miss ——— will reply to any question if you wish.

LILIAN WHITING.

Some time later, Dr. Hodgson obtained an account of the incident from the percipient herself, who writes as follows :

March 30th, 1892.

DEAR SIR,—Your letter dated March 25th, has just reached me, and I hasten to say that this is the first communication that I have received from you. Miss Whiting's account of my dream must in some way have been lost in the mail. I have no doubt but that it was quite accurate. However, to avoid giving you more trouble, I will just write it out briefly. I was visiting friends fifty miles away from my mother's home. I had not seen her for some weeks, and I did not know that she had been having attacks of a heart trouble, which caused her death. She had always been strong and well, with the exception of rheumatism, and the thought of her dying had never entered my mind. I retired at eleven o'clock, and fell asleep immediately, and as soon as I slept, my mother came to me in a dream; she was dressed in black and looked very young. She put her arms around me and said: "Do not cry, you have done everything that you could for me." This she repeated several times; then I awoke, disturbed and troubled, with tears on my face.

In the morning I told my friends that I was troubled about my mother because of a vivid dream. In two hours the telegram came, saying that she was dead. I went immediately, and before I was told anything about the manner of her death, I told my dream. My sister-

in-law said: "Why those were mother's dying words." She was taken ill at nine o'clock in the evening, and died at ten. She looked at my sister and said: "Do not cry, you have done everything that you could for me, but I am dying," and with these words she was gone.

If I had dreamed this after I knew that she was dead, I should not have been surprised, but as it is, it seems to me wonderful, and I can but feel that she was permitted to come, in order to prepare me a little for the shock.

The following corroborative notes from Miss ——'s sister-in-law and the friend with whom she was staying at the time of her mother's death were afterwards received.

March 29th, 1893.

The account that my sister, Miss ——, gave of mother's dying words, and those which mother spoke to her in her dream as being the same is quite correct. Miss —— arrived the day after mother died, and before I told her of her last words she told *me* of her dream.

March 30th, 1893.

Miss —— was visiting me at the time of her mother's death, and at breakfast, before the telegram came, she spoke of having had a vivid dream of her mother.

A third dream case (L. 1108, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 328)¹ is taken from *My Canadian Journal* by the Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava. A footman in the service of Lord Dufferin went out fishing, and slipping off a rock into the water was drowned. In a letter dated seven days later a girl to whom he was attached wrote to him: "I have been in my new place a week, and I like it very much, but I had such a dreadful dream on the day of my arrival. I dreamt that you and Nowell were upset in a boat together, and that Nowell was saved but you were

¹ The case is also given from the same source, but rather less fully, as G. 236 in the *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 85. Evidently it was accidentally printed twice over.

drowned." The only veridical point in the dream was the agent's death by drowning. The percipient cannot by any possibility have heard of this by normal means.

A fourth dream death-coincidence with possibly a veridical adjunct (L. 1124, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 33) comes to us through Professor Alexander of Rio de Janeiro, to whom the dreamer, Dr. C. H. de Silva, was well known. The dream appears to have occurred about six hours before the death of a relative, Sr. I. E. Monteiro, and at the hour of an acute crisis in his illness—the dreamer not knowing him to be ill. In the dream he appeared on one side of a railway or tram station holding out some papers insistently to the percipient, who was on the other side of the station. The latter crossed the line quickly, and on his stretching out his hand to take the papers the vision ceased and he woke up immediately. The dream was very vivid and suggested the death of the agent to the percipient, who told it in the morning. There was some reason to think that the proffered papers represented some pension fund receipts about which the agent was anxious.

The fifth dream case of the kind (L. 1139, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 278) is a very curious one, and important because it raises the whole question of possible animal agency, the apparent agent being a dying dog.

(L. 1139.)

The percipient was Mr. Rider Haggard, and his account of the case was first published in *The Times* for July 21st, 1904, from which we quote it :

DITCHINGHAM, *July 16th.*

Perhaps you will think with me that the following circumstances are worthy of record, if only for their scientific interest. It is principally because of this interest that, as such stories should not be told anonymously, after some hesitation I have made up my mind to publish them over my own name, although I am well aware that by so doing I may expose myself to a certain amount of ridicule and disbelief.

On the night of Saturday, July 9, I went to bed about 12.30, and suffered from what I took to be a nightmare. I was awakened by my wife's voice calling to me from her own bed upon the other side of the room. As I awoke, the nightmare itself, which had been long and vivid, faded from my brain. All I could remember of it was a sense of awful oppression and of desperate and terrified struggling for life such as the act of drowning would probably involve. But between the time that I heard my wife's voice and the time that my consciousness answered to it, or so it seemed to me, I had another dream. I dreamed that a black retriever dog, a most amiable and intelligent beast named Bob, which was the property of my eldest daughter, was lying on its side among brushwood, or rough growth of some sort, by water. My own personality in some mysterious way seemed to me to be arising from the body of the dog, which I knew quite surely to be Bob and no other, so much so that my head was against its head, which was lifted up at an unnatural angle. In my vision the dog was trying to speak to me in words, and, failing, transmitted to my mind in an undefined fashion the knowledge that it was dying. Then everything vanished, and I woke to hear my wife asking me why on earth I was making those horrible and weird noises. I replied that I had had a nightmare about a fearful struggle, and that I had dreamed that old Bob was in a dreadful way, and was trying to talk to me and to tell me about it. Finally, seeing that it was still quite dark, I asked what the time was. She said she did not know, and shortly afterwards I went to sleep again and was disturbed no more.

On the Sunday morning Mrs. Rider Haggard told the tale at breakfast, and I repeated my story in a few words. This I need not do here, as the annexed statements set out what occurred quite clearly.

Thinking that the whole thing was nothing more than a disagreeable dream, I made no enquiries about the dog and never learned even that it was missing until that Sunday night, when my little girl, who was in the habit of feeding it, told me so. At breakfast time, I may

add, nobody knew that it was gone, as it had been seen late on the previous evening. Then I remembered my dream, and the following day enquiries were set on foot.

To be brief, on the morning of Thursday, the 14th, my servant, Charles Bedingfield, and I discovered the body of the dog floating in the Waveney against a weir about a mile and a quarter away. The two certificates of the veterinary surgeon, Mr. Mullane, are enclosed herewith. They sufficiently describe its condition.

On Friday, the 15th, I was going into Bungay to offer a reward for the discovery of the persons who were supposed to have destroyed the dog in the fashion suggested in Mr. Mullane's first certificate, when at the level crossing on the Bungay road I was hailed by two plate-layers, who are named respectively George Arterton and Harry Alger. These men informed me that the dog had been killed by a train, and took me on a trolly down to a certain open-work bridge which crosses the water between Ditchingham and Bungay, where they showed me evidence of its death. This is the sum of their evidence:

It appears that about 7 o'clock upon the Monday morning, very shortly after the first train had passed, in the course of his duties Harry Alger was on the bridge, where he found a dog's collar torn off and broken by the engine (since produced and positively identified as that worn by Bob), coagulated blood, and bits of flesh, of which remnants he cleaned the rails. On search also I personally found portions of black hair from the coat of a dog. On the Monday afternoon and subsequently his mate saw the body of the dog floating in the water beneath the bridge, whence it drifted down to the weir, it having risen with the natural expansion of gases, such as, in this hot weather, might be expected to occur within about 40 hours of death. It would seem that the animal must have been killed by an excursion train that left Ditchingham at 10.25 on Saturday night, returning empty from Harleston a little after 11. This was the last train which ran that night. No trains run on Sunday, and it is practically certain that it cannot have been killed on the Monday morning, for then the blood would have

been still fluid. Also men who were working around when the 6.30 train passed must have seen the dog on the line (they were questioned by Alger at the time and had seen nothing), and the engine-driver in broad daylight would also have witnessed and made a report of the accident, of which in a dark night he would probably know nothing. Further, if it was living, the dog would almost certainly have come home during Sunday, and its body would not have risen so quickly from the bottom of the river, or presented the appearance it did on Thursday morning. From traces left upon the piers of the bridge it appears that the animal was knocked or carried along some yards by the train and fell into the brink of the water where reeds grow. Here, if it were still living,—and, although the veterinary thinks that death was practically instantaneous, its life may perhaps have lingered for a few minutes,—it must have suffocated and sunk, undergoing, I imagine, much the same sensations as I did in my dream, and in very similar surroundings to those that I saw therein—namely, amongst a scrubby growth at the edge of water.

Both in a judicial and a private capacity I have been accustomed all my life to the investigation of evidence, and, if we may put aside our familiar friend “the long arm of coincidence,” which in this case would surely be strained to dislocation, I confess that that available upon this matter forces me to the following conclusions:

The dog Bob, between whom and myself there existed a mutual attachment, either at the moment of his death, if his existence can conceivably have been prolonged till after 1 in the morning, or, as seems more probable, about three hours after that event, did succeed in calling my attention to its actual or recent plight by placing whatever portion of my being is capable of receiving such impulses when enchained by sleep, into its own terrible position. That subsequently, as that chain of sleep was being broken by the voice of my wife calling me back to a normal condition of our human existence, with some last despairing effort, while that indefinable part of me was being slowly withdrawn from it (it will be remembered

that in my dream I seemed to rise from the dog), it spoke to me, first trying to make use of my own tongue, and, failing therein, by some subtle means of communication whereof I have no knowledge telling me that it was dying, for I saw no blood or wounds which would suggest this to my mind.

I recognise, further, that, if its dissolution took place at the moment when I dreamt, this communication must have been a form of that telepathy which is now very generally acknowledged to occur between human beings from time to time and under special circumstances, but which I have never heard of as occurring between a human being and one of the lower animals. If, on the other hand, that dissolution happened, as I believe, over three hours previously—what am I to say? Then it would seem that it must have been some non-bodily but surviving part of the life or of the spirit of the dog which, so soon as my deep sleep gave it an opportunity, reproduced those things in my mind, as they had already occurred, I presume, to advise me of the manner of its end or to bid me farewell.

There is a third possibility which I will quote, although the evidence seems to me to be overwhelmingly against it, and, for the reasons already given, it is inherently most improbable—namely, that the dog was really killed about half-past 6 on the Monday morning, in which case my dream was nothing but a shadow of its forthcoming fate.

Personally, however, I do not for a moment believe this to have been the case, especially as the veterinary's certificate states that the animal's body must have been "over three days" in the water at the time of its discovery.¹

¹ Sir Rider Haggard omits here (but see the end of his letter of 23rd July below) a fourth possibility, namely, that a telepathic impression may have reached his mind at the actual time of the dog's death, but remained latent, only emerging into consciousness when a favourable moment arrived. The possibility of such deferment in the emergence of an impression is difficult to prove except in some experimental cases, but it is generally assumed and is one reason for allowing a margin of twelve hours after the apparent moment of death in counting the apparition of a dying person as a phantasm of the living. References to the subject will be found in several places in Gurney's book (see in the index under "Deferment or latency in telepathic impressions"). It is also discussed in Myers' *Human Personality*, ch. vii., § 107, Vol. II., pp. 12-13, etc.

On the remarkable issues opened up by this occurrence I cannot venture to speak further than to say that,—although it is dangerous to generalise from a particular instance, however striking and well supported by evidence, which is so rarely obtainable in such obscure cases,—it does seem to suggest that there is a more intimate ghostly connection between all members of the animal world, including man, than has hitherto been believed, at any rate by Western peoples; that they may be, in short, all of them different manifestations of some central, informing life, though inhabiting the universe in such various shapes. The matter, however, is one for the consideration of learned people who have made a study of these mysterious questions. I will only add that I ask you to publish the annexed documents with this letter, as they constitute the written testimony at present available to the accuracy of what I state. Further, I may say that I shall welcome any investigation by competent persons.

H. RIDER HAGGARD.

The veterinary surgeon who examined the body of the dog wrote to Mr. Rider Haggard as follows:

BUNGAY, *July 14th*, 1904.

DEAR SIR,—In pursuance of your instructions I have inspected the dog found in the water at the Falcon Bridge, Bungay.

It was in a very decomposed and tympanitic condition. In answer to your inquiries,

(1) I believe it is your dog Bob, which I have frequently attended and which was at my house for one week under treatment.

(2) Cause of death.

Fracture of skull in three places, the skull being smashed almost to a pulp by some heavy, blunt instrument. The wounds are not caused by gun shot.

(3) The body must have been in the water over three days, and very probably the dog was killed on the night of July 9th (Saturday), after which it was missing.

Both forelegs were fractured just below the knees. I

should say this was done by a large trap, probably an otter trap, as the injuries are too severe and high up the legs to be caused by a rabbit trap. It seems probable that the dog went to the water to drink and stood upon the table of the trap, his body being afterwards thrown into the river.

P. J. MULLANE, M.R.C.V.S.

Mr. Mullane wrote later :

BUNGAY, *July 15th*, 1904.

To H. Rider Haggard, Esq.,—Having heard the story of the destruction of the dog "Bob" by a train on Saturday night, I am of opinion that his injuries are compatible with that method of death. The guard of the engine might have shattered his head and the wheels of the engine severed the bones of the fore legs.

P. J. MULLANE, M.R.C.V.S.

Mrs. Haggard wrote :

DITCHINGHAM HOUSE, BUNGAY, *July 15th*, 1904.

On the night [of] July 9th I was awakened by most distressing sounds proceeding from my husband, resembling the moans of an animal, no distinct words. After listening for a few moments, I woke him up, whereupon he said that he had had a nightmare, in which he was engaged in some struggle connected with our retriever dog "Bob," and that "Bob" was trying to talk to him and explain that he wanted help. It was quite dark at the time, so I conclude it must have been about 2 a.m.

M. L. HAGGARD.

Miss Haggard wrote :

July 14th, 1904.

On Sunday morning, July 10th, my father mentioned at the breakfast table that he had had a horrid nightmare about my black retriever dog "Bob."

He said that he dreamt the dog was dying in a wood and trying to make some communication to him. My mother corroborated this statement, saying he had made such a noise that he had even awakened her, and she aroused him as he seemed so disturbed.

Of course we all laughed at it at the time, for we did not know then that anything had happened to the dog, for I had seen him myself at 8 o'clock on the preceding evening.

ANGELA RIDER HAGGARD.

Miss L. R. Haggard wrote :

July 14th, 1904.

On the evening of Sunday, July 10th, I, who am in the habit of feeding the dogs, told Daddy that "Bob" had not come to his breakfast or his supper that day, so I thought he must be lost.

Daddy had said at breakfast on Sunday that he had dreamt that "Bob" was dying in a wood, and that he, Daddy, was trying to extract something from "Bob," and that "Bob" was trying to speak.

LILIAS R. HAGGARD.

A lady relative who lives at Ditchingham House wrote :

July 14th, 1904.

On Sunday morning at breakfast Louie [Mrs. Rider Haggard] said "Rider" [Mr Rider Haggard] "had a nightmare last night, and made such noises that he woke me up, and I had to wake him."

When Rider came down we talked about his nightmare, and he said with a laugh, "Yes, it was old 'Bob,' he was being killed, and he was calling out to me to save him."

L. R. HILDYARD.

Mr. Haggard's secretary wrote :

DITCHINGHAM HOUSE, *July 15th, 1904.*

At breakfast on Sunday, the 10th, Mrs. Haggard laughingly complained of having been disturbed in the night by the noise Mr. Haggard made in his sleep, so much so that she had been obliged to wake him up. Mr. Haggard explained that he had had a nightmare, in which he had been struggling violently, and also dreamt that he had been trying to understand something that the dog "Bob," who was dying, was saying to him.

IDA HECTOR.

The above letters were published in *The Times* with Mr. Rider Haggard's account. In reply to our request to be allowed to see the original documents, Mr. Haggard kindly lent them to us for comparison with the printed copies and also sent us the originals of three other statements relating to the case, which we print here.

(1) *From Mr. Mullane.*

BUNGAY, *July 15th*, 1904.

TO H. RIDER HAGGARD, ESQ.

DEAR SIR,—It is my opinion, from the condition of the dog's head, that he was killed instantaneously by a very violent blow over the skull.

P. J. MULLANE.

(2) *From H. Alger.*

I was at my business on the line between Bungay and Ditchingham at 7 o'clock on the morning of Monday, the 11th July, when only one train had passed about 6.30, and found the broken collar of a dog lying there, which I produce, and had to scrape off the dried blood and some bits of flesh from the line. I asked several people who were working about and were there when the 6.30 train passed, including Mr. Runnicles and Mr. Riches, if they had seen a dog on the bridge, as one had been killed there. They said that they had not.

If the engine-driver had seen a dog run over, he would have reported it. Under all the circumstances, I think that the dog must have been killed by the late excursion train on Saturday night which left Ditchingham for Harleston at 10.25. From the way in which the flesh was carried, it was evidently killed by a train going towards Bungay.¹

The marks of blood upon the piles showed where the dog had fallen from the bridge into the reeds. These reeds grow in deepish water.

I did not myself see the dog in the water; my mate, Arterton, saw the body of the dog after it had risen to the surface.

¹The train that passes Ditchingham about 6.30 on Monday morning is also one that goes towards Bungay.—EDITOR.

It was I who cut the collar as you see it now. I did so that it might be sewn together and used again for some other dog.

[Signed] HARRY ALGER.

(3) *From C. Bedingfield.*

DITCHINGHAM, *July 14th*, 1904.

My master and I found the dog in the Waveney near the Falcon Bridge on the morning of July 14th. It is the retriever dog, Bob, which I have known ever since it has been at Ditchingham House.

[Signed] C. BEDINGFIELD

(Groom at Ditchingham House).

In reply to further questions as to the possibility of the dog having been killed on the Monday morning instead of Saturday night, Mr. Haggard wrote to us:

DITCHINGHAM HOUSE, NORFOLK,
July 23rd, 1904.

I believe that I am right in saying that if the dog had been killed on the Monday morning, it certainly would not have floated by the Monday midday or afternoon when it was seen by Arterton.

No, I think the water is too deep for the body to have been seen lying at the bottom and been mistaken for a floating dog. Further, Harry Alger, when he found the traces of the accident, looked in the water on the Monday morning and could find no dog. It must therefore have risen to the surface between the Monday morning and Monday afternoon, as I believe it would naturally do, had it met its end on the Saturday night. In short, I am absolutely convinced that when I had my dream the dog had been dead for at least three hours. Further, this appears to be evident: the injuries to the dog's head were such that death must have been instantaneous; and even though life lingered in the tissues, as a doctor to whom I was talking this morning told me it might do for a little while, from the moment that engine struck the dog's head, it must have been utterly incapable of thought or volition as we understand it—that is, its brain

was destroyed; it was physically *dead*. It seems to result therefore that in order to produce the long subsequent impressions upon myself, it must have been spiritually *alive*. In short, even supposing that I received those impressions at the moment of the death of the dog and stored them up for future use, or that those impressions were flying about in the air like a wheeling hawk waiting for an opportunity to settle on my head, they must still have been emitted by the personality of an animal that was already *dead*, doubly dead from *fatal* injury followed instantly by drowning.

I seem therefore to come to this conclusion. Either the whole thing is a mere coincidence and just means nothing more than indigestion and a nightmare, or it was the spirit of the dog on its passage to its own place or into another form, that moved my spirit, thereby causing this revelation, for it seems to be nothing less. . . .

H. RIDER HAGGARD.

From an interview in *The Daily Chronicle* of July 22nd, 1904, to which Mr. Haggard referred us, saying that it was "fairly accurate," we extract the following:

Bob, although he belonged to my daughter, who bought him three years ago, was a great friend of mine, but I cannot say that my soul was bound up in him.

He was a very intelligent animal, and generally accompanied me in my walks about the farm, and almost invariably came to say good morning to me. He was rather rheumatic, as he was getting into years—seven perhaps—but that did not prevent him going after rabbits, generally in company with Bustle, my spaniel.

Another letter from Mr. Haggard appeared in *The Times* of August 9th, 1904, discussing the issues involved, and giving further details of the probable mode and circumstances of the dog's death, as follows:

. . . I am satisfied that the dog was destroyed about 10.27 on the night of July 9th. It had, I think, been rabbit-hunting or following some other canine attraction,

and being hot and tired, lay down upon a sleeper of the open bridge above the cool water, and resting its head upon its paws, placed them on the rail, thus lifting them a few inches above the ground. This was its invariable custom when a turf edging or anything of the sort was available. Thus it went to sleep. But whether asleep or awake, the blow which it received from the wheel guard of the engine must, I presume, if it did not cause instant death, at any rate have utterly destroyed its mind-powers, unless dogs can think with some portion of their organism other than the brain, of which in this instance the case was utterly smashed. . . .

[As to the suggestion that the telepathic information may have come from a human being who witnessed the death of the dog :]

My answer is that no human being would have been wandering about on a dark night in a place so dangerous as an open timber-work railway bridge over a river. I am convinced that the only creature which can have seen the dog's death was another smaller dog which may or may not have been with it at the time. . . .

As to the question whether he had had any other experiences of the kind, and in regard to some of the peculiar psychological features of this case, Mr. Haggard writes to us later :

. . . I never remember any other telepathic dream. From time to time I have had uneasy dreads which have proved baseless, but the only tangible mysterious event which I can recall was a fore-knowledge of future sorrow, which some months later proved itself to be fearfully accurate.

. . . Was the nightmare or first dream the whole story of what happened ? I am inclined to think so from what I remember of it and the animal noises that I made (see my wife's evidence). To what can be attributed the hallucination that I seemed to rise from the body of the dog ? This was one of the most curious parts of the manifestation—like the separation of soul and body, as one might imagine it. Another curious point was the

fashion in which, abandoning its attempt to talk (I thought because it was too slow) as I departed from it, the dog seemed to *flash* the intelligence of its dying state upon my mind. In an instant I knew all about it,—through the intelligence, not through the senses.

This case is one of very unusual interest from several points of view. It is, therefore, specially satisfactory to have it so well authenticated, and Mr. Rider Haggard deserves the gratitude of psychical researchers for having collected all the available evidence so promptly and completely, and put it at the disposal of the scientific world.

For other cases of possible animal agents, see above, L. 1142, L. 1144, L. 1158, pp. 116, 139 and 141. Also perhaps a case mentioned below, L. 844, p. 342. There is also a case in *Proceedings*, Vol. XIV., p. 285, of a dog being seen running across the room at Mentone about the time of its death in Norfolk, but the agency of those in charge of the dog is here possible.

Two dreams may be briefly mentioned in which the dying agent was seen with symbolical adjuncts. In one (L. 1166, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 140) which came to us through the American Branch, Mrs. Pool dreamt she saw her brother carried into her house in an open coffin, on the night he died suddenly, at a distance. In the other (L. 1175, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 75) Mrs. Comyn, on the night her mother died unexpectedly, dreamt she saw her looking very young and gay. She disappeared in the midst of a crowd of singing voices.

Death Coincidences—(d) appearance of a relative of the dying person.

I turn next to cases in which the person seen was not the dying person but one closely connected with and in the company of the dying person at the time. In the first of these (L. 1153, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 317) the percipient "Miss R." sitting up in bed saw the face of the widow of the person who died about an hour and a half

after his death. She saw and recognised the face, and saw it as it were in duplicate—either two images of it at the same time or one immediately after the other (cf. L. 979, above, p. 208). The widow is known to have talked of the percipient that night and about the time of the experience. The case is recorded by a good observer who has had no other experience of the kind, and it is well evidenced except that unfortunately Miss R. did not speak of it or make a written note of it till after the news of the death came. She had in fact not thought of it in the two days' interval. It is this, and the fact that Miss R. prefers to remain anonymous, that prevents my lengthening this paper by quoting the case in full; though my knowledge of the accuracy and carefulness of the percipient makes me think it rather an important one.

A dream case of the same kind (L. 1211, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 35) reached us through Sir Oliver Lodge, to whom it was reported in the first instance. The dreamer is Mrs. Walter Browett, of Westfield, Coventry, and the first account of her experience which we received was as follows:

(L. 1211.)

Statement by Walter Browett of Westfield, Coventry, Solicitor.

January 30, 1917.

This morning at 8 a.m. my wife told me that she had had a vivid dream about an aunt, always referred to as "Auntie Maude." She said she met her dressed in black with widow's weeds, and she told my wife that her husband was dead.

My wife had not seen her for some years, but they exchanged letters occasionally, the last letter being about a week ago on an entirely trivial matter. My wife had never seen Auntie Maude's husband to whom she was only married last October.

When we came down to breakfast we found a letter from Auntie Maude, the contents of which are of no importance. It was written and posted yesterday at a place near

Shrewsbury. I naturally remarked to my wife that that was the end of her dream.

At 1.30 p.m. we received a telegram as follows: "My husband passed away last night. Auntie Maude." So far as we can remember we had neither of us either spoken or thought of Auntie Maude or her husband since last week.

WALTER BROWETT.

In reply to our request for a first-hand report of her dream from Mrs. Browett, we received the following statement:

WESTFIELD, COVENTRY, *February 19, 1917.*

At the end of October, 1916, my late mother's only sister, Mrs. Short, to whom I always refer as "Auntie Maude," was married to a Mr. G. M. Meire, Eyton-on-Severn, Shrewsbury. I have not seen her for several years, and I never saw him. On the night of Monday-Tuesday, January 29th-30th, 1917, I dreamt that I saw Auntie Maude in widow's weeds, and felt that her husband was dead. I told my husband about it directly I awoke and described her dress. At breakfast we found a letter from her, from which apparently all was well. About 1.30 we received a telegram from her as follows: "My husband passed away last night. Auntie Maude."

F. M. BROWETT.

We also wrote to Mr. Browett pointing out the importance from an evidential standpoint of making it clear that Mr. Meire's death was sudden and that neither he nor Mrs. Browett had any reason to anticipate it. In this connection we asked Mr. Meire's age and we also asked whether the telegram announcing his death had been preserved. Mr. Browett replied as follows:

WESTFIELD, COVENTRY, *February 19, 1917.*

In reply to your letter of the 16th inst. I now enclose a statement written and signed by my wife [see above].

I also enclose the letter therein referred to and a letter from Mrs. Meire dated the 14th inst., in which she describes the manner of her husband's death on the 29th ult.

You will see that there was nothing in the first letter

to suggest that Mr. Meire's health was affected. As a matter of fact, we knew that he used to rise at 6.30 to go round his farm, and when I saw him—for the first and last time—at the wedding in London he appeared to be a healthy man—slim and wiry. I went to his funeral and then learnt that his age was 67. He had been very active during the afternoon of the 29th and had said how well he felt. . . .

The telegram was not kept, but it was only a "confirmation" one, the original message having been telephoned up here from the Coventry G.P.O. I saw Mrs. Meire after the funeral and she told me that she did not know that her husband had any heart trouble.

Before mentioning my wife's dream to her, I asked her whether her thoughts turned to any one in particular when her husband died. She said: "To you, of course. I said to myself I wish Walter were here to help me." She said that she did not remember thinking of my wife further than she would of necessity do when thinking of me. My wife is her god-daughter and the only one of the family with whom she is really intimate.

WALTER BROWETT.

Of the two letters from Mrs. Meire to which Mr. Browett refers above, the earlier, dated January 29, 1917, and received by Mrs. Browett on January 30 *after* she had told Mr. Browett of her dream, makes only one reference to Mr. Meire, and says nothing of his health. The second letter, dated February 14, 1917, which is too personal to print here, makes it evident that Mr. Meire's death was quite unexpected. He died of heart-failure about 11.30 p.m. on January 29, 1917, having been to all appearances in good, normal health a few minutes before.

The fact that the telegram announcing his death to Mr. and Mrs. Browett has not been preserved is of little moment. The hour and day of the death are sufficiently established by Mrs. Meire's letter of February 14, 1917, confirmed by the announcement in the *Times* of Feb. 2, 1917, as follows:

MEIRE.—On the 29th Jan., at Eyton-on-Severn, near Shrewsbury, George Haughton Meire, aged 67.

A dream (L. 1115, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 127) coinciding with a death, but in which the wrong person was dreamt of, may perhaps be mentioned here. It was sent to Mr. Myers by Mr. G. R. Sims, who dreamt that his sister came to him and told him his *father* had died. He told the dream to his housekeeper in the morning. About twenty minutes later his sister did come round to tell him of the death during the night of a brother-in-law. If we knew more of the circumstances, we might be able to explain the distortion of the telepathic communication if there was one.

Death Coincidences—(e) symbolic.

Three symbolic experiences, to which not much importance can be attached, conclude the visual death coincidences. In L. 966 (*Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 181) Miss Williams saw a lovely round light over her head as she passed through a dark room "just about the time" of the death of a woman whom she knew to be dying, and with whom she at the time connected the light. In L. 1093 (*Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 130) Mrs. Knight had impressions of being raised up in bed, of a shimmering light, and of raps on the bed-head, all of which, as well as a subsequent dream of death symbols, she took at the time to indicate that some friend was dying. She did not, however, think of the death of the friend who actually died that night. In L. 1094 (*Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 134), a dream case which came through the American Branch, Mr. Morse dreamed on the night of his wife's unexpected death at a distance that he was dressed in mourning and taking a long journey. He mentioned his interpretation of the dream before he heard of the death.

Death Coincidences—(f) auditory.

Next must be considered a few auditory death coincidences. There has been an auditory element combined with the visual in two of the waking experiences and some of the dreams already discussed, but in those that follow the auditory element is either the only element or

the only veridical one. There is one waking experience—it was at the moment of waking—in which words were heard (L. 929, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 204). The percipient was a girl of thirteen, but the case was not recorded till four years and three months after it happened. I quote part only of the record. The case was looked into by Mr. Myers, who writes :

(L. 929.)

I heard the following case from Miss Elsie Spears, the percipient, and also, separately, from her elder sister, Miss Spears, at their home, 48, Godwin-street, Birmingham, December 18th and 17th, 1891. I took down the statement of each, which they revised and signed. I also saw a card announcing that the girl here called Clara “Died September 15th, 1887, aged 13.” The two brothers sent me their written corroborations on December 22nd.

F. W. H. M.

The Percipient's Account.

My greatest friend was a girl whom I will call Clara, of the same age as myself. We had always been together and were as intimate as girls can be. Clara had a little sister of four years old, whom I will call Maggie. This little Maggie was very ill, and Clara and I were very anxious about her. I went away from Birmingham to Sutton for my health. I was to stay some time longer. On Wednesday, September 14th, 1887, I was very anxious to write to Clara, but I had rheumatism in my hands and could not do so. I had been thinking much about Maggie on the night of September 14/15th. In the morning I suddenly found myself wide awake, the room being already light. A voice was saying, close to me, “Don’t fret, Elsie; Maggie is living, but it is Clara that’s dead.” I looked round, but there was no one there. Almost at that moment the clock struck six. The voice was sad. Next day I felt certain that Clara was gone, and, although my hands were better, I could not bring myself to write to her. . . . On the Saturday I went out to do an errand for the lady with whom I

was staying. But suddenly I felt that I could not turn that way but must go towards the station. As I did so, I met my brother, who had been sent to bring me home. . . .

The next case (L. 1180, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 327), a dream, is interesting from several points of view. There was undoubtedly a dream of a death somehow connected with Sir R. H. a few hours after his brother, General H.-S., died. But if it was telepathic, the communication was incompletely developed both in its manifestation (the name being incomplete) and in the percipient's apprehension of it. Again it is difficult to see why the communication came to Miss F. at all. May we suppose that it was intended for Sir R. H. but failing to reach his normal consciousness was as it were reflected on to Miss F. who knew him well? Or was it an instance of a piece of information interesting to the percipient being accidentally picked up by her during sleep from those who knew it? The case seems comparable to P. 269 and L. 1127 (pp. 147 and 144 above), where a sister learns a brother's place in examination, etc., having no connection with any possible agents unless it was through him.

(L. 1180.)

The case was communicated to us by General Sir R. H., who, while informing us of the full names of all the persons concerned, requested us to print their initials only. He gives a preliminary statement of the circumstances, as follows :

In order to understand the dream, I should mention that my elder brother some years ago took on an additional surname, so that from General H. he changed to General H.-S. I am correctly referred to as General H., or Sir R.

My brother decided to have a slight operation, and the doctors and surgeons considered there was no risk. The operation took place in a Nursing Home in London on April the 25th [1910], and was considered a success. On the 26th he was found to be suffering severely from

shock, but this nearly all passed away on the 27th. On the 28th he was not so well, and by night time the case was very serious. On the morning of the 29th the doctors decided that the only hope lay in sleep. Morphia was given every 4 hours. Before the first injection, about 7 a.m., he was quite collected and calm, and agreed to sleep. His son, R., had been with him all the time, and his daughter, B., arrived in the early morning, and she exchanged a few words with her father. For the rest of the day he was drowsy under morphia. About 6.30 p.m. he began to collapse, and breathed his last at 7 p.m., in the presence of his son and daughter and the doctors.

Before the operation he was in excellent health, and very strong for his age, 66.

Miss F. [the dreamer] met my brother once, a year or two ago. She had met his daughter some years ago, and she met his son on the 13th April last for the first and only time, and she knew slightly one of my sons, who received a telegram from his cousin at about 8 p.m. on the 29th, announcing the death. I have ascertained that not one of these three persons had given a thought to Miss F., and it would have been strange if they had.

At my request the lady referred to by Miss F. has signed as correct the statement made to her on April 30th.

Miss F. is devoted to my wife and myself; she saw us and our daughter off from Victoria Station for the Continent on April 16th; and just in fun I gave her our accident insurance tickets for the journey, requesting her to hand them over to my son in case of a tragedy. Before she had heard of my brother's death, she wrote to my wife and said she was anxious to hear news of us, as we had promised to send a postcard on arrival, and she made some joking reference to the insurance tickets, but no mention of the dream she had had. We do not remember having promised to send the postcard. Miss F. is middle-aged, absolutely reliable, clever, very exact and methodical.

It will be observed that Miss F. dreamed of my brother's death a few hours afterwards, on the night of April 29-30,

but she did not know of his death till the night of May 7th.

At about 6 p.m. on April 30th I received at Aix-les-Bains a telegram from my son to say my brother had died on the 29th.

R. C. H.

Miss F.'s account, dated May 8th, 1910, is as follows, the second signature being that of the lady to whom she told her dream on the morning after its occurrence :

An Account of my Dream of the night of April 29th-30th.

In my dream I somehow became aware of the fact, "General H. is dead." There was a slight hesitation after H., as if an instrument at work had gone wrong, and made a hissing sound. There did not seem any one about to explain, but I queried in my own mind, "If they mean Sir R., why is his title omitted?" Again the fact was repeated, and again with the slight hesitation, and the sound of an "s," as in hissing, and that and the omission made me feel (in my dream) that there was something inaccurate about it, though I felt convinced it had to do with Sir R.'s family, and that it was because I knew him the information was given to me. The next morning (Saturday, April 30th) about 11 a.m. I met a friend, to whom I told my dream, and I said, "I do wish I could hear from Aix, as I know my dream has something to do with Sir R.; he is mixed up in it somehow, I am quite sure." So as I was anxious, I despatched a letter to Lady H. But neither asleep nor awake did I once think of the H.-S.'s.

E. H. F.

A. H. C.

On receiving this account Sir R. H. sent a number of questions to Miss F., the answers to which she embodied in a second version, written on May 19th, 1910. The first part of this is an almost *verbatim* repetition of what she had written before; she then adds :

About 11 a.m., Saturday, April 30th, I met a friend in the Edgware Road, to whom I told my dream, and

stated my anxiety in consequence of it, adding "I wish Lady H. had sent me a line, as she kindly promised to do when we parted a fortnight previously." My friend, Miss C., remarked, "But Sir R. did not go abroad ill." "No," I replied, "but a good deal can happen in a fortnight; all three of them could be dead and buried in that time; however, do not go away with the idea that it is Sir R., for I am sure it is not, as there was no title, though at the same time I know he is mixed up in it, so I wish they would write."

Being still anxious, I wrote to Lady H., either that night or Sunday afternoon, May 1st, but did not mention my dream, though I stated I was anxious for news. I began my letter with a small joke, though feeling in anything but a joking mood.

Lady H.'s letter of May 5th reached me on the night of May 7th. From it I learnt, for the first time, of General H.-S.'s death having occurred on April 29th, and the thought flashed through my mind, that accounts for all those "S's" in my dream.

Strange to say, I never once thought of the H.-S.'s until I received Lady H.'s letter, and yet I had met General H.-S., his son, and daughter.

E. H. F.

A. H. C.

In reply to a further question, Miss F. writes on June 30th, 1910 :

I write to say positively that I had not heard of General H.-S.'s illness or operation previous to my dream.

To the above case the following dream (M.Cl. 88, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 293) has a certain analogy, though the veridical point relates to an event of public not private interest. A few instances of a similar kind were published in the supplement to *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II., pp. 365-370. There are also two cases in the *Journal*, Vol. V., which are described in Podmore's book. Compare also M. Aut. 104, p. 73 above.

(M. Cl. 88.)

The case was contained in a letter from Mrs. T. A. Williams to her nephew, Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, of King's College, Cambridge, through whom we received it.

ROSSLYN COTTAGE, PILGRIM'S LANE, HAMPSTEAD,
July 25th, 1894.

On Monday morning [June 25, 1894], at about 8 o'clock, Arthur got up and went to call Philip, whom he woke out of a sound sleep. Philip's door is nearly opposite ours, and I heard them laughing, and called out to know what the joke was. Arthur came back and told me Philip had had an absurd dream that the President Carnot had been assassinated. I said I saw nothing "funny" in that, and he answered, "Oh! the joke was that he dreamed that M—— R—— (a young Frenchman who lives in Hampstead) had announced the news, adding that *he* expected to be elected President," at which we all three laughed again.

Arthur dressed and in about half-an-hour went downstairs, rushing up again almost immediately, shouting to Phil (whose door was then locked) "*He is assassinated,*" and pointing out the announcement in large print in the *Daily News*.

A strange part of it is that Philip takes little or no interest in politics of any kind, and declares that, to the best of his recollection, Carnot's name has not been mentioned in his hearing. Carnot was stabbed at 9.30 on Sunday night, and died about 4 hours afterwards.

E. B. WILLIAMS.

THORNTON A. WILLIAMS.

PHILIP H. WILLIAMS.

The two last signatures are those of Mrs. Williams' husband and the percipient, her son.

The date of the assassination of President Carnot was Sunday, June 24th, 1894.

To complete the death coincidences in the collection, two cases remain to be described, both auditory. In

both the sounds heard were non-vocal and were heard apparently by all within earshot. This makes it plausible to suppose that they were real sounds unexplained, and but little importance would have been attached to them were it not that in each case they occurred exactly at the time of the death—almost to the minute apparently—of a person interested in one of the percipients. I will describe the cases briefly. The first (L. 1141, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 320) was sent by Mr. J. F. Young, some of whose own experiences have been given above (see pp. 116 and 129). He knew the percipient Mrs. Page well. Further evidence, completing the case, was collected by the Rev. A. T. Fryer. The experience, which was recorded on October 22, 1904, occurred on December 21, 1903. At three o'clock in the morning Mrs. Page in one room and her three daughters in another heard footsteps coming up the stairs and three knocks on Mrs. Page's door. She and one of her daughters got up and went into the passage, but found no one. The next morning a message was brought to them that a Mr. Morgan, to whom Mrs. Page had been very kind during his long illness, had died at that hour. The percipients had not in the night associated the sounds with him

The second case (L. 1151, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 196) was sent to us by Mr. E. R. Pease, who wrote as follows :

(L. 1151.)

November 1st, 1905.

. . . a working woman was dying of cancer and was visited daily by Mrs. Rix of Headland Cottage, Limpsfield. She died at 5.20 a.m. on Tuesday [really Monday] last, Oct. 30th. At the same hour both Mr. and Mrs. Rix heard a knocking at their door. . . . Mrs. Rix went down to see what was there and found nothing. It is stated that the servant also heard the knocking, but this may be inaccurate. It is stated that the night was windy, but even on the windiest of nights, one does not get up at 5.20 to go to the front door. At any rate I never did. . . .

Mr. and Mrs. Rix kindly sent first-hand accounts of the incident, rather fuller, dated November 10, 1905. These substantially agree with the above statement. They supposed the knocks at the time to be made by one of the dying woman's children come to fetch Mrs. Rix.

§ 2. *Coincidences with Illness or Accident.*

In this section I have put together cases of waking hallucinations and dramatic dreams corresponding with illness or accident occurring to the presumed agent, or to some one closely connected with him. In such cases the correspondence is apt to be less definite than in death coincidences, and therefore the evidence for telepathy less clear. There are, however, some remarkable cases where the correspondence is clearly, I think, beyond chance.

I will take first a case (L. 1207, *Journal*, Vol. XVII., p. 230) which seems to me one of the most remarkable in our collection. The coincidence is with an attack of fatal illness and the coincident phantasm was a waking vision—a scene represented as it were pictorially, but externalised in the actual space in which the percipient found herself.

We received it through Sir George Beilby, to whom we are much indebted for the care with which all available evidence has been collected.

(L. 1207.)

The percipient's experience took place on April 4, 1913, and her account of it, which we print below, was given in a letter to Sir George Beilby, written three years and a half later, as follows :

October 4, 1916.

I will write out the incident which, if you remember, I told you by word of mouth in Glasgow last June—the incident of my "sight" or vision of my brother in Australia shortly after he must have fallen into the unconsciousness which lasted till his death some days later.

It was if I remember rightly on the Friday evening [April 4, 1913], and,—which will fix the date,—I had been attending a Committee Meeting called on that evening to help the election of the Rev. Joseph Johnson, minister of the Park Avenue Congregational Church, Ashton-on-Mersey, to the Knutsford Board of Guardians. The election was to take place on the following day. We had an animated meeting, and with my thoughts full of this I left before its close, and (alone) turned out into the brightly lighted and bustling thoroughfare of School Road, Sale.

I had walked but a few paces when I was staggered by seeing, as in a cinema show, reflected in the air in front of me a clear-cut picture of my brother in Australia, lying with the unmistakeably helpless look of a dead or unconscious man who had just fallen. I saw his pose, his clothes, and even his thick curling hair as if in life before me.

Mechanically I must have continued walking as no one appeared to notice me; but I felt my brother was dying or dead, or that something tragic was happening to him, and I began at once praying for him in an agony of supplication. The picture faded, and I hurried on out of the light of the shops and into the darkness of Wash-way Road.

Suddenly, when halfway along the road, the picture shone out again before my eyes, this time against the dark sky. Again I saw the prone helpless figure, the colouring of clothes and hair, then as before it faded quickly away, and I did not see it again. I think it was between 8 and 9.30 p.m., or about then, that I left the meeting. I remember that my sister had not been very well, and that she was in bed. When I reached home I ran up to her room and broke down in telling her what I had just seen, saying I was "sure something had happened to Edgar." I remember she tried to soothe me by saying I was simply overtired—that I should get away to bed and "would see things would be all right in the morning." I tried to believe this would be so, but all the Saturday and Sunday following I kept thinking of my brother and

praying constantly for him. On the Monday morning the post brought a nice kind letter from him written from Hobart from our cousin's home there, enclosing a belated birthday gift for our small nephew, dated 4th March. We were so glad to have the letter, and my sister said : "Now you see Edgar is all right."

On the Thursday morning (*i.e.* April 10, 1913), my sister being still confined to bed, I sent up the letters to her, then suddenly I heard her cry out, and I rushed upstairs to find her sitting up with a scared look holding out the (enclosed) letter from Mr. Huie, C.A., from Edinburgh, stating that he had just received a cablegram from Melbourne announcing the death on April 7th of our brother Mr. J. Edgar Paterson.

The next news we had was when our sister-in-law's letter (enclosed) arrived telling us how Edgar, when travelling home from New Zealand to Melbourne, had suddenly fallen down unconscious on the ship when nearing Melbourne, had been carried ashore at Melbourne unconscious, and placed in Hospital there (on the Saturday, April 5th, 1913), where he had lingered without regaining consciousness till the Monday, April 7th, when he slipped quietly away.

MARY M. PATERSON.

We have received the following corroborative statement from Miss Paterson's sister, Mrs. George Francis, to whom, as related above, she described her experience on the evening of April 4, 1913, before she knew anything of her brother's illness :

October 29th, 1916.

This is to certify that what my sister, Mary M. Paterson, has written *re* Friday, April 4th, 1913, and her experience then regarding her sight of our brother, is just what she told me on her return from the Election Meeting.

I perfectly remember the occurrences she describes in her accompanying letter to Sir George Beilby.

EMILY FRANCIS.

According to Miss Paterson's clear recollection, confirmed by Mrs. Francis, her experience took place when she was on her

way home from an election meeting held on behalf of the Rev. Joseph Johnson. As to the date of this meeting Mr. Johnson wrote to Miss Paterson as follows :

August 23, 1916.

We were glad to have your letter. Mrs. Johnson, R——, and myself remember the account of your brother's vision ; and when we get back I think I can verify that date about the Election Committee. I know it was in April. . . .

J. JOHNSON.

*(Note by Mr. Johnson, received by Miss Paterson,
October 28, 1916.)*

Election, April 5, 1913.

J. JOHNSON.

The meeting which Miss Paterson had attended took place on the day preceding the election, and we have therefore good evidence for the conclusion that Miss Paterson saw the apparition of her brother, as described by her, on Friday, April 4, 1913, between 8 p.m. and 9.30 p.m.

With regard to the time and circumstances of Mr. Edgar Paterson's death, we have received the following evidence :

*(Letter to Mrs. Francis from Messrs. Huie and Ramage,
C.A.)*

EDINBURGH, *April 9, 1913.*

I greatly regret to intimate to you that I have been informed by cable from Melbourne that Mr. Edgar Paterson died suddenly there on 7th inst. I annex a copy of the cable.

Perhaps you will be so good as to inform Miss Paterson.

. DAVID HUIE.

(Copy of Cablegram.)

Melbourne on 8th 12.30 p.m.

Huie Edin.gh.

J. Edgar Paterson died suddenly Melbourne seventh.
Notify sisters. . . .

(*Extracts from Letters written by Mr. Paterson's widow in Australia to Mrs. Francis and Miss Paterson.*)

1. *April 15 [1913].*

. . . Since I wrote you last week a friend of mine has called who was on the steamer with Edgar. He says he was the life of the boat, as he always was, and on Thursday night [April 3, 1913] he was quite bright and seemed quite well, but on Friday morning when he was getting up he broke a blood-vessel, caused by a complication of liver and kidney troubles. . . . Two doctors stayed with him constantly from when he took ill on Friday, 4th inst., until he was removed to the Hospital, 5th inst. . . .

2. *May 14 [1913].*

. . . How funny Mary for you to have had that experience or presentiment about Edgar on the Friday night, for that was the day he took ill. . . . Lily says he must have been thinking of you at the time. . . .

3. *June 24, 1913.*

. . . One of my brothers-in-law saw the Captain of the steamer Edgar was on. He took ill between 10 and 11 on Friday morning and was up and dressed. He went unconscious at once. Two doctors, who were on the steamer as passengers, stayed with him constantly then a specialist was called on the steamer when it arrived in Melbourne on April 5th, and an ambulance took him to the Hospital and they wired me. . . .

GEORGIE PATERSON.

It is established by the evidence given above that Mr. J. Edgar Paterson was taken ill quite suddenly on board ship, when on his way to Melbourne, between 10 and 11 a.m. on Friday, April 4, 1913 (Victoria time), that he became unconscious at once and died in hospital in Melbourne on April 7, 1913. By Greenwich mean time, therefore, he was taken ill between midnight and 1 a.m. (approximately) on April 4, 1913,¹ and he had been unconscious about twenty hours when

¹ "Standard time" in Victoria is ten hours in advance of Greenwich mean time.

Miss Paterson saw the apparition of him between 7 p.m. and 9.30 p.m. on that day.

There are several points of interest about the form of this experience. First, the pictorial form of sensory hallucination which I have called a vision—externalised but not realistic, not forming an apparently natural part of the surroundings—is unusual among spontaneous cases. An experience resembling it has been given among semi-experimental cases (G. 267, p. 54 above), and a spontaneous one, which the percipient decided was a dream, has been quoted among death coincidences (L. 978, p. 213 above). Another waking vision will be found below (L. 1193, p. 278). Crystal visions are generally of this kind, and a spontaneous vision in a glass of water is given above (L. 1134, p. 45). Probably L. 1198 (see p. 339 below) was a vision. Other cases have been published—see *e.g.* *Proceedings*, Vol. X., p. 217. For a waking vision which was apparently entirely mental, not externalised in space, see L. 1160 (p. 149 above). Compare also M.Cl. 22 (p. 57 above) and L. 1152 (p. 58 above).

Secondly, the repetition of the phantasm after an interval is unusual. It occurs in one or two dreams in this collection, but not, I think, in any other waking experience except the semi-experimental vision, G. 267, just referred to.

Thirdly, it was not a mere apparition of the dying man, but had other veridical elements. The brother was seen lying unconscious with his clothes on, which must have corresponded to what happened at the onset of the attack of fatal illness some twenty hours before the vision. Whether the vision represented contemporaneous fact—the costume, for instance, at the moment of its occurrence—we do not know; nor, of course, do we know when the telepathic communication took place, and whether or not it remained latent in the percipient's subconscious mind to emerge at a suitable moment.

In the next case (L. 1209, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 19) we have similarly a veridical element in the appearance

of the bandages as actually worn by the agent. There is also the same impossibility of fixing the exact time coincidence. The apparition was seen before any of the family knew the agent had been wounded, but not till some thirty hours after the wound occurred, though much less time after he was admitted to the hospital at Boulogne. The misrecognition of the phantasm at first, and its failure even when recognised to appear in the semblance of the agent familiar to the percipient is very curious. It suggests some faulty transmission between the subliminal and supraliminal consciousness. An undeveloped figure in the darkness first suggested the little boy in the flesh, and the idea of a child having entered the percipient's mind perhaps could not be shaken off again. The bandage may have then produced the association of ideas with the youthful portrait of the agent.

(L. 1209.)

Our earliest information about the case was contained in a letter from Lieut. Bridge, as follows:

ENFIELD, GATESHEAD,
November 2, 1916.

The following presents an unusual feature to me—but possibly you can explain it.

My age is 34.

I was wounded in France July 24th, 1916, 3.30 p.m.

Between 1 and 2 a.m. July 26th, 1916, I appeared to Mrs. S. Jones (my wife's mother) at this address, waking her from sleep.

The physical appearance corresponded with that of a photo taken when I was about 3 years old—the head was bandaged shewing only forehead—eyes—nose—mouth, and a little of the chin.

Except for the age and apparent height (only head was seen clearly)—this was the condition I was in, and I was in hospital at Boulogne—to the best of my recollection asleep, and of course with 2 days' growth of beard.

The apparition was taken for my son "in the flesh"

at first and was asked what was the matter. Mrs. Jones then recognized me—I smiled and vanished.

The War Office telegram announcing the casualty was received at 9 p.m., July 26th.

Mrs. Jones did not know me till I was about 19—at which time and ever since I have had a small moustache—and she always thinks of me as grown up—never as a child. In these circumstances, can you explain why I should appear as a child and not in my most easily recognizable form?

That I appeared to Mrs. Jones I can understand as she is more psychic than my wife.

G. E. W. BRIDGE, Lt. Durh. L.I.

The above is substantially correct. I might add that I had not looked at the photograph mentioned for at least 4 years.

E. M. JONES.

In reply to this letter we wrote to Lieut. Bridge asking for a detailed report by Mrs. Jones herself and a corroborative statement, if obtainable, from some person to whom she had related her experience before the news came that Lieut. Bridge was wounded. We received an answer from Mrs. Bridge as follows :

ENFIELD, GATESHEAD,
November 5, 1916.

My husband has just returned to duty. . . . I enclose a full account written by Mrs. Jones, of her experience of July 26th. This corresponds with her description to me on August 5th.

I see that it is unfortunate, from the point of view of 'evidence,' that she told no one before this date. I can only say that as far as we ourselves are concerned, this makes no difference, as we do not admit the possibility of her altering the facts, even involuntarily. She is particularly clear-headed and well-balanced, and when relating one or two rather similar experiences, I have never known her vary in the accounts in the slightest degree.

I am not surprised that my husband should appear to her,—they have often discussed such things, and are much in sympathy—though the ‘least-familiar’ form has puzzled us all. . . .

MARGARET E. BRIDGE.

(Statement by Mrs. Jones, enclosed in Mrs. Bridge's letter of November 5, 1916.)

ENFIELD, GATESHEAD.

During the early morning of Wed., July 26th, 1916, I woke from sleep, with the idea that someone was in my room. I opened my eyes to absolute darkness, but at the right side of my bed stood a misty figure, which I at first took for my little grandson, and I asked him why he was there. No answer came, but the face became more distinct, and I saw it resembled a photograph of my son-in-law, taken when he was about three years old. In the photograph one can see short curls, but in my vision the lower part of forehead, eyebrows, eyes, nose, mouth and part of chin were clearly visible, but hair, ears, lower part of chin and neck were hidden by white wrappings. As I looked and wondered, the mouth expanded into a smile, and the appearance vanished, the room being still in darkness. My grandson had not been quite well the previous day, and my first thought was to go and see if he were worse, but as I knew his mother had settled to sleep in his room, I decided not to risk alarming her.

I did not mention the occurrence to anyone, as we only had servants in the house, and naturally I did not want to say anything to my daughter at once. I made up my mind to wait until she had had a letter from her husband of later date than July 26th, and then tell her how anxious I had felt.

The W.O. wire came on the evening of July 26th, and in the rush and hurry of her departure I had no chance to tell her until she came home on Aug. 5th for a couple of nights, leaving her husband in hospital. When I described what I had seen, she told me that his head and neck were bandaged in that way.

I could understand his appearing to me as he looks *normally*, as we have been great friends, and I have made my home with them for some years. The puzzle is why he should appear to me as a young child.

ELLEN M. JONES.

We then wrote to Mrs. Bridge, putting the following questions :

(a) Is it possible to get any evidence corroborating Mrs. Jones's recollection that her experience took place in the early morning of July 26, 1916: *e.g.* Mrs. Jones mentions that your son had been unwell on the previous day; have you any evidence as to when he was unwell?

(b) When did you first know the nature of the wound from which Lieut. Bridge was suffering? Were any details on this point given in the War Office telegram?

(c) Has this telegram been preserved, and can we see it?

(d) How old is your son now, and is he noticeably like the photograph of his father to which Mrs. Jones refers?

(e) Is there any reason to suppose that when Lieut. Bridge was a young child, *i.e.* at about the time when this photograph was taken, he had an accident which necessitated the bandaging of his head?

The object of these last questions, (d) and (e), was to see whether any association of ideas could be found in the mind of Mrs. Jones which would account for the circumstance that she saw the apparition of Lieut. Bridge in the shape of a photograph of him taken as a child many years before she knew him. The fact that Mrs. Jones had been concerned about her grandson's health on the previous day might account for her momentarily identifying the apparition with this boy as she did (see above), but there was no apparent link with the photograph of Lieut. Bridge.

To these questions Mrs. Bridge replied as follows :

ENFIELD, GATESHEAD,
November 18, 1916.

(a) My boy used to suffer very much from asthma. Last July he had a very slight return of this, following

an attack of hay-fever. I noted in my diary that I kept him in bed on Sunday, July 23rd. On the 25th he was "decidedly better" but still in bed, and I continued to sleep in his room. On the morning of the 26th he was "practically all right," and on the 27th was out of doors again.

(b) My husband was wounded by shrapnel, all down the left side. I first knew the locality of the wounds on the morning of July 28th, when I received by the first post (1) a few lines scribbled by my husband in the trenches, at 4.30 p.m., on the 24th: "I'm hit slightly in the face and arm. Shell. Merely skin wounds. Don't worry." And (2) a letter from his Coy. Commander of same date: "He was hit by little bits of a 4.2 shell—slightly in face, arm and leg." I knew no further particulars until I saw him in hospital in London on July 29th. The W.O. telegram does not say anything about the locality of the wounds.

(c) I have this telegram before me now. . . . I quote it in full:

"York O.H.M.S. 8.15 p.m. *Received* Newcastle July 26. 8.26 p.m.

"Mrs. Bridge. Enfield. Gateshead.

"Regret Capt.¹ G. E. W. Bridge admitted 7 Stationary Hospital Boulogne July 25 gunshot wounds multiple Condition satisfactory Territorial Records."

I received it here at "Enfield" at 9.15 p.m. Time noted in my diary. A taxi arrived at almost the same moment to take a visitor to the station and I sent a maid with her, to despatch a telegram from Newcastle to the Hospital at Boulogne.

(d) My boy was 10 years old on July 27th, and was never particularly like the photo in question. But Mrs. Jones used to remark on my girl's resemblance to the photo, when she was about 3 years old. She is now 7½, but when a baby, 9 months old, she had an operation

¹ Lieut. Bridge had held a temporary captaincy in a reserve battalion before proceeding to the front. Hence the use of this title in the telegram.

which necessitated a head-bandage. Mrs. Jones saw the child, on one occasion only, and for a few minutes, with this bandage. We none of us know of any accident to my husband which would have made it necessary for him to have his head bound up. MARGARET E. BRIDGE.

To this letter Mrs. Jones added a note, thus :

When the telegram came telling us of my son-in-law's wound, I at once concluded he had been wounded on the Tuesday night (July 25, 1916), and was surprised when we heard later that it was on the Monday afternoon.

E. M. JONES.

We have also received an additional communication from Lieut. Bridge, as follows :

November 9, 1916.

. . . From a purely evidential point of view, it is a weak point that Mrs. Jones did not mention her experience till the first opportunity *after* the news, but a comment of my wife's when telling me of it is to a certain extent corroborative: "I thought she had something on her mind that day—she was so restless and fidgetty—and seemed relieved when the telegram came."

Usually Mrs. Jones is particularly self-controlled and possessed.

I think you have hit upon the solution of the form of the phantasm.

My daughter when about the same age looked very like the photo, and when young had an operation which necessitated a head bandage very similar to the one I had. This in conjunction with the keen sympathy existing in the family suggests a very feasible train of thought—especially on just awakening from sleep.

This explanation to my mind counteracts the other defect slightly, as in the case of moulding an indistinct presentiment or an intelligent anticipation upon a known *fait accompli*, the complication of the child-like appearance would not have been added.

Another factor is that Mrs. Jones (her daughter, and I

to a less extent) is so accustomed to this type of experience that there is no question of fear confusing the impression received.¹

G. E. W. BRIDGE, Lt.

It is difficult to judge in the next case (L. 1088, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 78) whether the illness was sufficiently definite to constitute a striking coincidence with the percipient's hallucination, which occurred on the line between sleeping and waking; but it is interesting that telepathic communication seems to have taken place between the agent and percipient on other occasions. I give two of these which occurred within our five-year limit.

(L. 1088.)

The Hon. Miss K. Ward writes:

84, SLOANE STREET, S.W., April 22nd, 1897.

(I)

Two years ago, on awaking one morning at 8 o'clock, I saw a distinct appearance of my sister Emily, seated at the foot of my bed in her night-gown. She was rocking herself backwards and forwards as if in pain. Putting out my hand to touch her, the phantasm vanished. Going into my sister's room half an hour later, I related to her my experience, and she (being still in much pain) informed me that at 8 o'clock she had actually been in the position above described, *on her own bed*, and had meditated coming into my room, but had not liked to disturb me; (she had been perfectly well the night before). My sister's room is at some distance from mine, being divided therefrom by a corridor and cross-door.

KATHLEEN WARD.

EMILY G. WARD.

¹ An account of several of these earlier experiences has been sent to us by Mrs. Jones "not for publication." They are all of an hallucinatory character, and include (i) two visual hallucinations, apparently premonitory; (ii) a visual hallucination (of a fully developed figure) for which Mrs. Jones cannot account in any way. So far as she is aware it was subjective and not veridical; (iii) an auditory hallucination, contemporaneous with the sudden illness (a fainting-fit) of the person whose voice was heard.

(II)

On the 12th of February, this year, my sister and I were driving together. In the course of conversation, I mentioned an absurd dream I had had the preceding night, in which I appeared to have been in possession of a bicycle made of pure gold, studded with rubies and diamonds. "That is most extraordinary!" exclaimed my sister; "for in bed last night I was reading a silly story which came out in this month's *Cyclists' Touring Club Gazette*, about a rider who owned a bicycle as dazzling as the one in your dream!" I must mention that I had not seen that particular number of the *Gazette*, or indeed any other, as I do not belong to the club in question.

KATHLEEN WARD.

(III)

On the 20th of last month, my sister Emily was lunching with Mrs. Maude. In conversation they got upon psychical subjects, and my sister related some of the experiences given above. After lunch Mrs. Maude suggested a game of "Patience," the particular one fixed upon being known to us as "Demon Thirteen." In wishing my sister good-bye, Mrs. Maude said, "Now ask your sister what we did directly after lunch, and see whether she can tell us." Later on my sister met me at another house. She at once asked me Mrs. Maude's question. In a moment the vision of these two bending over the cards, came before me, and I said, "Playing Patience." "And which game?" pursued my sister. (We know and play at least twenty varieties.) "Demon Thirteen," was my answer. I should add, that my sister had never happened before to play "Patience" at that particular hour. I shall send this to Mrs. Maude, asking her kindly to append her signature, stating that above is correct.

KATHLEEN WARD.

The following note is appended:

I can vouch for the correctness of above.

JENNY MAUDE.

The next case (L. 1129, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 263) is again one of not very serious illness, and again one on the line between sleeping and waking. It is interesting that it should be followed by a more or less veridical dream.

(L. 1129.)

The following letter was addressed to Mr. Piddington. We were asked not to print the writer's name and address :

DEAR SIR,

Oct. 6th, 1901.

On reading your letter to the *Spectator* of Oct. 5th, I thought you might possibly be interested in a coincidence which took place at the end of August last. I am attached to a certain young lady. At the time I refer to I was staying near Peterboro' and the lady in question was at her home, a seaside town in Yorkshire. One very close and thundery night I found some difficulty in getting to sleep. When finally I fell asleep, or rather dozed, the face of Miss D. rose up before me, and to my surprise one side of her face was very much swollen and she looked very unhappy. I sat up in bed and spoke to her, only to find that I had been dreaming. Again I fell asleep and dreamt that I was walking along a street, when I heard a cry above me, and looking up saw Miss D.'s face at a window from which smoke and flames were issuing. I rushed upstairs, only to see her face floating in the smoke, very much swollen. I tried to grasp her, and woke up with a cry. Somehow the dream depressed me, and next day in writing to Miss D. I told her the whole thing, much as I have told you. Imagine my surprise a day after, when I heard from her that on the night in question she had gone out to see a house on fire—Mrs. K.'s seaside residence; had contracted a chill, and gone to bed with her face enormously swollen up, and had suffered severe toothache all night. Our letters on the subject will confirm dates, etc. . . . H. B.

Mr. H. B. was an undergraduate of — College, Cambridge. He was asked to call on Mrs. Verrall and give her further

particulars, and he did so on October 16th, 1901. Mrs. Verrall reported as follows :

5, SELWYN GARDENS, CAMBRIDGE, *Oct. 16th*, 1901.

I have just seen Mr. H. B., and have no doubt at all that the case is genuine. At the same time the evidence is not quite so complete as I had hoped from his letter, but these are the facts as given me by him : On a certain Sunday in August (subsequently ascertained to be the 25th) H. B. dreamt, as he told Mr. Piddington, that he saw Miss D. with a swollen face, and later on the same night, that he saw her at a window from which smoke and fire were coming. On Monday he wrote to Miss D. to ask if she had had a toothache, but on second thoughts decided that it would make him feel foolish if nothing had occurred, and so tore up the letter. On a later day in the week he was writing to her about other things, and then mentioned his vivid dream about the swollen face (this part of the business evidently impressed him much more than the fire). But before he sent this letter he received one from her mentioning that she had been suffering from a severe toothache and swollen face since Sunday night. This letter I have seen ; it is dated from Filey, on "Wednesday" (obviously August 28th), and begins by saying that she is sorry not to have written before, but has been "seedy ever since Sunday. I think I must have got a chill ; anyhow, I had raging toothache from Sunday night till" the day before, when she had the tooth out with gas. The letter went on to give a graphic description, with a sketch, of her appearance during the time that her face was swollen.

On the receipt of this letter, H. B. was so much astonished to find that his dream about the swollen face was true that he added a postscript to his letter (which had not yet gone) to say that he had seen her with a swollen face at a window from which smoke was coming, and to ask if that part of the dream was also true.

Her letter in answer to that I have also seen. It is dated from Filey on August 31st, 1901, and I copy the important part :—"I was awfully interested in your

dream ; it is the queerest thing I have heard of for ages. The funny part of it is that I got the cold which made my toothache so bad by going out on Sunday evening, hearing that there was a fire on the Crescent. It was Mrs. K.'s house ; one of the bedrooms got on fire. It was nothing much, and was put out before the Fire Brigade arrived. . . . Auntie M. first noticed smoke coming out of the window." The writer goes on to say (and this seems to me very interesting) "M. gave me a sleeping powder on Sunday night, so I slept heavily, in spite of the pain." She also says that she thought about him a good deal on Monday night when she had seen what a sight she was, but not on Sunday.

Of course it is unfortunate, evidentially, that nothing was posted from him to her till after her letter mentioning the swollen face. At the same time I think the two letters of hers which I have seen establish the truth of his statement that he mentioned the fire to her before hearing of it from her. His whole account of the matter impressed me as frank and accurate ; he showed me the whole of the letters, which were in their envelopes, so that the postmarks confirmed the contents of the letters as to dates.

He does not think that the lady will have kept his letters, nor that it would be of any use to write to her for corroboration.

He tells me that he has never had any similar experience before ; he dreams constantly, but he dwelt emphatically on the very vivid nature of the earlier part of this dream. The impression was so strong that he sat up and spoke to the lady before he realised that he was dreaming. He has several times guessed the thoughts, after an interval of silence, both of this lady and of one of his three sisters ; he has had no success with his other sisters, nor has he ever had any impression unless he and the sister (or Miss D.) were in the same room. Since this episode he dreamt that Miss D. was angry with him, and encouraged by the August experience, he wrote to her to ask if it were true. She replied that it was not, but that on the same night she had dreamt that he was angry with her.

M. DE G. VERRALL.

A simple dream of illness (L. 964, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 168) came through the American Branch. Mr. M'Culloch, writing in January, 1892, reports that while away from home in the autumn of 1889 he dreamt that his wife was beside him and that he heard her say "I am so sick." He told the dream to two friends who corroborate, and on returning home a few days later found that his wife had been taken ill that night and sent for the doctor.

In the following case (L. 1195, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 41) it is perhaps more natural to suppose that the person intending to telegraph was the agent rather than the sick person, but the coincidence is undoubted:

(L. 1195.)

The dream was reported to Sir Oliver Lodge by the percipient, Mr. W. E. Perry, as follows:

18, PALMERSTON RD., SPARKBROOK,
Feb. 3rd, 1913.

On Thursday morning last at about 8.0 I was on the point of getting up when I suddenly dropped asleep again and dreamt that my father (deceased 10 years) came to me and, immediately after, I saw a telegram which contained the words "Come Grannie." I at once seemed to look for the sender's name but could not make out the name.

My father seemed connected somehow with the message, and yet the telegram was not in any one's hands but simply lay against the surrounding dark.

On awaking I told my wife that her grandmother was worse and related the dream. I enclose the telegram [which fulfilled the dream]. I had a similar experience at the death of my father, but then I heard my name distinctly called three times, and so distinctly the third time that I was awake when I heard it. W. E. PERRY.

The telegram, now in our possession, is worded *Come Grannie sinking rapidly unconscious*. It is stamped "Sparkbrook,

Birmingham, Jan. 30, '13," and is timed as having been handed in at Derby Rd., Longeaton, at 8.50 a.m., and received at Sparkbrook at 9.15 a.m.

In reply to an enquiry from Sir Oliver Lodge as to the time when he told his wife of the dream, Mr. Perry writes :

18, PALMERSTON RD., SPARKBROOK,
BIRMINGHAM, *Feb. 4th*, 1913.

. . . The time at which I told her was between 8.30 and 8.40. I could not tell to a minute or two, as while I quite expected the dream to be fulfilled, I was not thinking of it as a case for the Psychical Research Society. It was only after I had seen my wife off at the station that I remembered some of the cases in your "Survival of Man," and decided to communicate with you.

W. E. PERRY.

Mrs. Perry corroborates as follows :

Feb. 19th, 1913.

On the morning of Jan. 30th my husband told me that he had dreamt that Grannie was worse and he had seen a telegram which asked for me to come. This was soon after 8.30 a.m., and the telegram came about three-quarters of an hour later, while we were at breakfast. At the time he told me of the dream I attached no special importance to it, but thought the coincidence strange when the telegram came.

WINIFRED A. PERRY.

We asked Mr. Perry whether his grandmother's condition was causing him any anxiety at the time of his experience, and his reply is as follows :

18, PALMERSTON RD., SPARKBROOK,
BIRMINGHAM, *Feb. 19th*, 1913.

I may say that we knew Grandmother was breaking up, her age being 87, and should not have been surprised to hear of her death, but we were not anticipating the end to be so near. Grandmother had been able to get about well up till about a week prior to Jan. 30th, and both my wife and I thought that a few days in bed

would enable her to recover strength as previously. The death took place on Friday morning at 4.10, Feb. 7th.

W. E. PERRY.

The following symbolic dream (L. 937, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 251) is narrated by Professor Charles Richet's cousin, Mme. Vavin, originally in French, here translated. The account is undated, but as it was printed in the *Journal* for May 1892, the interval between the experience in December 1891 and the report of it cannot have been very long. It is an interesting case of gradual emergence of the veridical idea. The dream coincided with the beginning of the fatal illness of Professor Richet's father, the facts concerning which are as follows :

(L. 937.)

On Saturday, December 26th, 1891, [in the south of France], M. A. Richet, aged 76, [the father of Professor Ch. Richet], was seized with a violent bronchitis, which during the night of December 26th-27th led to violent agitation and some delirium. Next morning telegrams were sent to M. Charles Richet and his other children in Paris, saying that their father's illness, although not precisely dangerous, was, at his age, a serious one. . . . During the Sunday the patient's state grew worse ; and he expired at 1 p.m., December 30th.

Madame Vavin writes :

I was very anxious and troubled as to the health of an Aunt who is very dear to me ; and on the evening of December 26th-27th, 1891, I had received a letter giving me very alarming news of this Aunt. I anticipated her immediate death, and went to sleep in this state of mind. I then dreamt as follows. I was present at a funeral, which seemed to belong to my family. I saw my brother in uniform and all my relations in mourning. I at first thought that this must be my Aunt's funeral ; —yet my grief did not seem to me to be as great as I should have felt in such a case ; and I saw in the group before me my cousin, the grandchild and nearest relative of this Aunt, in very slight mourning. Suddenly a voice

seemed to whisper these words in my ear, "This is not your Aunt's funeral,—but the funeral of M. Richet, who is about to die." At this moment I awoke.

Next day my brother told me that M. Richet was ill,—a fact of which I was quite unaware. I then told my dream to him and to several other persons.

MARGUERITE VAVIN.

Madame Vavin's brother, above referred to, corroborates.

(G. 234.)

Another symbolic dream of a funeral (G. 234, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 83) recorded before the dreamer knew of the death may be mentioned here, though it did not coincide definitely with illness or with death. It occurred to Mr. J. V. Owen in America between the death and funeral of his mother in England. She was very old, but he knew of no special reason for anxiety. He wrote to his sister before he knew of the death, in answer to her letter announcing their mother's serious illness, as follows :

I dreamed I was in a house where there was a funeral going on. Everybody was dressed in black, and I saw you all there except mother, and father [dead 16 years] told me that she was dead, and that it was her funeral that was then in process of being carried out; and I have not been able to shake off the sad feeling it caused me since. If dear mother is still alive, tell her, etc. . . .

Another dream connected with a funeral (L. 994, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 176) may be naturally classed with the one just described. Again there is a want of very exact coincidence, but it was related before any coincidence was suspected, and it was recorded sixteen days after its occurrence. Mrs. Peebles dreamt that the baby of a friend of her daughter and acquaintance of her own was dead and preparations were being made for the burial. She dreamt this on the night of the day on which the funeral, which her daughter attended, had taken place, and told her husband of it in the morning, as he testifies, before they had heard of illness or death.

There are two experiences coinciding with the oncoming of fatal illness which the percipient did not at the time connect with the sick person. In the first (L. 967, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 183)—a waking auditory hallucination—no idea at all of illness or death seems to have been suggested. It is perhaps most reasonable to suppose in this case that the coincidence between the illness and the unrecognised call was accidental, especially as, if there was telepathy, the link between agent and percipient was apparently local only (cf. L. 1087 above, p. 183). To describe the case briefly, a nursery maid named Margaret heard herself called one night as she was preparing for bed. Supposing it was her mistress, Mrs. "Thompson," she went out into the passage but found no one, and while listening thought she heard a deep sigh. She spoke of the experience to the governess next day. Later it was learnt that Mrs. Thompson's brother-in-law, Mr. Edward Thompson, had been taken ill that evening and died two days later. His much-loved sister, also named Margaret, had till lately occupied the room in which the nursery maid and children now slept and in which she heard the call, and Edward Thompson's mind is said to have been dwelling on his sister during his illness. It will be observed, however, that the call "Margaret" heard by the percipient suggested to her a female, not a male, voice.

In the other unrecognised case (L. 987, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 106) which came through the American Branch of the Society, Mrs. Krekel, in a dream or in a state between sleeping and waking, heard a loud rap on her bed-head and afterwards saw an arm thrust over her shoulder handing her a large envelope with mourning border and the word death upon it. She told the dream to a friend, who corroborates. She afterwards learnt that her mother, 500 miles away, had been taken ill that night and died two days later. The account was written within a week of the experience. It appears that the mother had rapped on the furniture to call attention to her need of assistance, and Mrs. Krekel is inclined to attribute the auditory part of her experience to this fact; but this seems pressing the coincidence too far.

There are three cases—one of apparitions and two of dreams—in which two percipients are concerned, and which for this reason it is convenient to take together. In the first two the agent's experience is illness, as in the cases just dealt with.

In the first (L. 820, *Journal*, Vol. III., p. 356) the two percipients in different rooms, but on the same evening, see apparitions of the sick person. It has been described in *Proceedings*, Vol. V., p. 309, but I do think it has been printed in full except in the *Journal*, perhaps because, as will be seen, the accounts given by the two percipients are not completely consistent in detail. This is not surprising in records made more than two and a half years after the experience. It will be noticed that there was something a little grotesque—unlike a real person—in the behaviour or appearance of both apparitions, and a symbolic suggestion of mourning, and therefore death, in the second. One of the percipients, Mrs. Treloar, writes :

(L. 820.)

On August 26th, 1885, Mr. Treloar and I, then living at The Firs, Bromyard, dined with my brother, the Rev. W. Cowpland. Mr. Treloar's letter of March 3rd, 1888, will describe what happened.

"My wife and I were dining with my brother-in-law, and there met my wife's sister, who lived a short distance from the rectory. It was a very lively party, and this lady was in the best of health and spirits. It was on a Wednesday. . . . On the Tuesday following, in the evening, about eight o'clock, my wife, who had been in the nursery during the half-hour the nurse was having her supper, went into our bedroom, where there was a lamp burning on the dressing-table; and as she passed the bed, in going round to the other end of the room, she saw, as she thought, a black dress on the other side of the bed, but on looking again, a figure slowly rose up from what appeared a bent position, and looked straight at her for the space of three or four seconds; and she then recognised her sister. Her face was very pale, and had a look of anguish on it. My wife came downstairs, and I noticed

that she seemed troubled, and on asking her what had upset her, she told me. I, of course, thought it must have been a delusion. Next evening (Wednesday, September 2nd), just as we were sitting down to dinner, the groom of our doctor came to the house and said his master wished to see me. I went down and found him just about to start for my sister-in-law's residence, as he told me that she had sent for him, and from what he could learn she was in a most dangerous state from diphtheria. She died two days afterwards, and my wife never saw her, as it was, in the doctor's opinion, running too great a risk."

This account is correct, but does not state that just as I had told him of the apparition, my niece, Miss Maud Cowpland, who was staying with us, came rushing downstairs from her bedroom, whither she had gone a few minutes before—and simultaneously *I* began to tell *her* what I had seen, and she, scarcely heeding me, burst out, "I've seen Auntie Annie! I've seen Auntie Annie!" [Mr. Treloar confirms this.] I did not question her further then, but her letter appended shows what she saw. She left the house next day, I believe partly on account of the fright. I had never before seen, nor have I since seen, any apparition whatever, nor have I had any other experience at all resembling those which I here recount. After the first moment, I was not alarmed by the vision of my sister Anne. She was so remarkably vigorous and full of life that the idea of her death never occurred to me. In fact, what happened was this: there was diphtheria in the parish, and she most imprudently kissed a school-child suffering from that disease. On the Tuesday evening (when the figure was seen) she had retired early to her room, saying to her servants that she had a bad cold. They were young, and there was no one in her house to whom she would have spoken confidentially as to her state. All that can be known, then, of her condition at this moment is that she was alone in her room—whether asleep or awake we do not know—and that next day she sent for the doctor, and was fatally ill. There was a strong affection between her and myself.

I may add that the figure which I saw had a bonnet and veil on, the veil being tied back round her bonnet, as was my sister's wont. The lamp was bright, and so clearly did I see the figure that I observed the freckles on the nose. My sister had fine, expressive eyes, and their look in the apparition was full of anxiety and pain. The figure did not disappear instantaneously, but seemed to thin away into air.

Miss Maud Cowpland describes her experience as follows :

April 14th, 1888.

The year my father died I went to spend a few days with my aunt, Mrs. Treloar. The second night, after wishing her good-night, about a quarter-past ten, I retired to my room, and while having my bath I felt an unseen power compel me to turn towards a couch which stood at the foot of the bed, at the head of which (I mean the couch) stood a figure dressed in crape, whom I immediately recognised as Miss Cowpland, and exclaimed : "Why, Aunt Annie, how is it you are here ?" Then the figure gradually disappeared.

In answer to questions Miss Cowpland adds :

1. I have never seen anything before Miss Cowpland's appearance, but often before and afterwards, when alone, have felt people, or, I think I should say spirits, around and near me. One afternoon last summer, a feeling came over me as of a hand, with long, soft fingers, stroking my face.

2. The crape seemed to fall in thick folds from the crown of the head to the ground, but those folds over the face, instead of hiding, threw the features out most distinctly. I cannot say exactly how long it stayed ; perhaps half a minute ; not longer.

3. I am ashamed to say I felt most horribly afraid. . . .

I mentioned it to three people, Mr. and Mrs. Treloar, and the servant, whom I asked to sleep with me, as I was too much of a coward to do so alone after that, in that particular room. Yes, I remember Mrs. Treloar

telling me what she had seen; it was after that that I told her my experience.

The second case (L. 1210, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 25) was sent to us through Mr. George Tyrrell, an Associate of the Society, who is personally acquainted with the dreamers. The names and addresses of all the persons concerned have been sent to us, but we have been requested not to print them; we therefore give pseudonyms.

(L. 1210.)

Mr. "Lawson's" statement [Enclosed in a letter from Mr. Tyrrell, dated November 21, 1916.¹] is as follows:

Last July, when my daughter and I were staying in Somersetshire, I had a very vivid dream. I dreamed that I was in a bedroom, and saw lying on the floor my brother-in-law [Mr. R. Stephen (pseudonym)]; he was unconscious and looked perfectly ghastly. With some difficulty I lifted him on to the bed; as far as I could see, he was not breathing and I could feel no motion of his heart. I sprinkled some water on his face, but this having no effect, I ran to the door and called for assistance. No one came, so I ran out into the road where I saw two men and a woman. I told them that some one was very ill and asked them to go to the nearest public-house and bring some brandy; both the men refused, saying that the public-houses were closed, but the woman seeing my distress said she would try and get some, and I gave her 1s. for the purpose. She, however, did not come back again. On returning to the bedroom I found my brother-in-law lying just as I had left him. I then hunted over the house, but could find no one. I was in a terrible state of anxiety and distress not knowing what to do, and being pretty sure in my mind that he was dead. I then, just as I was giving all up in despair, awoke and rejoiced to know that it was only a dream.

Next morning I told my daughter of my dream while we were at breakfast, and she said, "How very curious.

¹ Mr. Lawson cannot remember on what day he wrote this account.

I, too, have had a very similar dream." These dreams occurred on July 3rd [1916], and on the 5th, when we returned home, I went to see my brother-in-law, and found him looking very bad. He told me that on Monday night, the 3rd July, he found himself lying on the floor and feeling very ill; he was utterly unable to move or to call for help. He thinks he must have been unconscious for a long time. Early in the morning, he managed to call the cook, and then remembers nothing more till 7 o'clock, when he sent for the doctor. He told me he had never felt so ill before, and quite thought it was all over for him; he said he felt such a longing for some one to come while lying on the floor, and a feeling of great distress at not being able to call for aid.

I may state that before leaving home, we had seen him in quite good health and had [heard] nothing of him while we were in Somerset.

[C. W. LAWSON.]

Mr. Lawson's daughter corroborates his statement, and adds an account of her own dream, as follows: This also was enclosed in Mr. Tyrrell's letter of November 21, 1916.

On Monday night, July 3rd [1916], I had a most vivid dream about my uncle [R. Stephen].

I dreamt that he came running up to me looking very ill; he handed me a book which he asked me to take down in the town. I asked him what was the matter, and he said: "I am very ill," and he then left the room where I and two or three other people were. The next thing I remember was that he was lying unconscious, and that none of us seemed able to go to his help. When I came down to breakfast the next morning, my father told me he had had a dream about Uncle [Bob] being ill; after hearing this, I was so impressed that I wanted to write and ask him how he was, as we were staying away at the time; but we did not write, as we were afraid of upsetting him. We returned home on the following Wednesday [July 5, 1916], and on Thursday morning my uncle came up still looking very ill and with

a nasty cut on his nose which he had got through his fall on the same night that I had dreamt about him.

[E. LAWSON.]

It has not been possible to obtain any statement from Mr. Stephen, since he greatly dislikes making any reference to his experience, but evidence as to the date and nature of his illness has been obtained from his cook and from the doctor who attended him.

[Statement by Mr. Stephen's cook concerning his illness, enclosed in Mr. Tyrrell's letter of November 21, 1916.]

At 1 a.m. on July 4th, 1916, I was aroused by hearing a thud which seemed to come from Mr. [Stephen's] room. I sat up and listened, but hearing no further sound, I went to sleep. At 3.45 I heard Mr. [Stephen] knocking at my door and saying: "Come quickly, I am very ill." I roused the housemaid and went to Mr. [Stephen's] room; we found him lying on the floor unconscious and looking very ill. I sent the housemaid for some whisky, and we managed to pour a little into his mouth, and then with difficulty lifted him into bed; he was icy cold, and I should think had been lying for hours on the floor; he then revived a little, and said: "I am feeling very ill. I think I am dying." I wanted to send for the doctor, but he would not let me. After a bit he seemed to get better, so we went back to bed; at 7 o'clock I went to his room and found him still very ill, and he agreed to my sending for the doctor. On clearing out his room the next day, I found clots of blood under the washing-stand, so the thud I heard at 1 o'clock must have been caused by his falling against the washing-stand, as his nose and face were cut about.

(Signed) [F. WILLIAMS] (pseudonym).

The doctor's statement, verified by reference to his professional diary, is as follows:

November 26, 1916.

I was called at 3.45 a.m. on July 4th, 1916, to see Mr. [R. Stephen] at — Cottage, —. He had then re-

covered consciousness (he had been unconscious for some considerable time), and was suffering from the effects of rather severe haemorrhage due to a wound caused by a fall.

[C. BARKER] (pseudonym).

It will be observed that Dr. Barker differs from the cook as to the hour at which he was called in. He is more likely to be accurate in such a matter, but the point is not important for our present enquiry. There seems little doubt that Mr. Stephen was first taken ill at about 1 a.m. on July 4, 1916, and that he remained wholly or partially unconscious for some hours.

In the dreams the veridical points, namely, the lying on the floor unconscious and the difficulty in getting help, are wrapped up in imaginary incidents of a dramatic character in which the dreamer plays a part.

In both these last two cases the two percipients were in different rooms, and we do not know that their experiences were simultaneous. They should be compared with L. 1223, p. 167 above. In the very striking dream case which follows (L. 1138, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 269), the two dreamers were together and apparently dreamt simultaneously and almost exactly at the time of the accident. The dreams were supplementary to each other rather than identical. The case was sent to us by the kindness of Miss K. Raleigh, of Beechwood, Loudwater, Bucks.

(L. 1138.)

The accounts were enclosed in a letter from Miss Raleigh, dated April 28th, 1904, and were, she says, written by the witnesses independently of each other. They gave their full names and addresses, but wished initials only to be printed.

Miss M. L. B. wrote as follows :

In compliance to the request of Miss K. Raleigh I have written thus :

On the evening of November 18th, 1903, I, M. L. B., retired about half-past nine o'clock and fell asleep. I

had a most peculiar vision or dream. I thought I was walking through streets in a strange place; it was artificially lighted; there were a number of people walking to and fro on either side of the streets. I heard a peculiar noise, and turned partly round to see what was the cause of it. A vehicle was coming rushing across the top of the street; I was a few paces down; it looked something like a train, but not a train, it was running on metals; something was coming down where I had crossed; there was an awful crash as if my (so-called) train had run upon something, and in a moment something heavy fell with a sickening thud on the pavement, at my feet. I tried to cry out, but could not. In a moment a crowd had collected, and several people picked up the body which had fallen at my feet. I could see it was a man. I could not see the face, only a large gash on the back of the head, and near the lips, from which the blood was flowing. As the drops fell they splashed into a puddle of blood on the ground and sprinkled on to me. Some one said, "Take him away." I tried to cry out, "What shall I do?" and awoke trembling and perspiring, and crying bitterly.

I could not think where I was, [but] found I was in bed, and had been dreaming, as I supposed. I lay quite still for fear of disturbing my sister. In a short time my sister lit a match and looked at her watch, and said, "It is past eleven o'clock." I did not tell her of my dream, as I did not wish her to worry. I thought it strange for her to get a light and tell me the time. I was fearfully worried for some days.

On the Monday morning following, I had another dream. I dreamed my brother, H. B., (I had not seen since the previous January, or even heard from him) was lying ill in a strange room, and a man was putting him in an ambulance. I thought he said, "Take my sister away, I am not fit to be where she is." He looked so strange, I awoke again in great agitation.

On the same evening a young friend, Miss P., came to call, and my sister left us alone. After she had gone I said, "R., have you heard if my nephew, or any one

belonging to me, has met with an accident, and they will not tell me, as I have had such strange dreams and feel I don't know what to do with myself. I feel haunted. I have not felt like this since just before Mother died." I told my dreams and cried very much. She said, "Don't fret," and assured me she had heard nothing concerning any one belonging to me. I still felt miserable.

On the 26th of November we received the news that our brother, H., was lying ill in F—— Infirmary, in a precarious condition; on the 27th we received the news that he was dead, died the previous day after the letter was posted to us. On the paper enclosed you will find all the main information we received regarding our brother's accident and death. If you compare the dates you will find the accident happened at the time I was dreaming about it. I had better state here I have never seen an electric tramcar. What I have written here is perfectly true.

I have not seen my brother either living or dead since a year last January, as I was much too ill to go to his funeral.

The other sister, Miss H. M. B., wrote :

November 18th, 1903, I went to bed at 10 p.m. and was going to sleep when a loud crashing sound roused me, and the voice of my brother followed saying, "Oh Duck, I am done for." I covered my eyes and said, "Oh H., is it your face that is hurt?" He said "No." The horror of it was extremely depressing. It was about 11.15 and I could get no sleep through the night, it worried me so. I had not seen my brother since the previous January, and he had not written to me since. Duck was his pet name for me.

Miss P., the friend referred to in the first account, wrote :

On the 23rd of November, 1903, I, R. P., went to ——— to see my friend Miss M. B. On the 23rd of November my friend told me of her distressing dream that she had dreamed on the 18th of November, 1903; it seemed as

if she could not forget it, she said that it seemed to worry her so. The time that my friend told me about her dream was between the hours of seven and eight o'clock in the evening, and my friend said it was some one had met with an accident, and the face was hurt, but [she] could not see who it was, and my friend said that it looked like a train, and yet not so, as it had no engine on, and my friend has never seen an electric car at all, and she could not forget her dream; and then on the 26th of November my friend had news about her brother's accident.

R. P.

Miss H. M. B. wrote later :

I did not mention my dream to any one until after my brother's accident. . . . He died on November 26th, 1903, and then my sister told me about her dream, and I said, how very strange [it was] we should each have such a strange experience and at the same time; I then told her all about it.

It thus happens that no further corroboration was obtainable of Miss H. M. B.'s experience; but the statement in her sister's account that she lit a match, looked at her watch, and told her what time it was, affords some indirect evidence in confirmation of her own.

The following paragraph describing the accident is taken from *Lloyd's Weekly News*, of November 29th, 1903.

ELECTRIC TRAMCAR FATALITY.

At F. yesterday Mr. D—— held an inquiry on H. B., 47, a horse dealer, of ——. Mr. H. W. T——, an official at the Bank of England, living at ———, stated that at a quarter to eleven on the night of Wednesday week [November 18th] he was on an electric tramcar going westward. They had just restarted from the Pack Horse when the deceased drove out of the Devonshire Road into the High Road right across the track of the car. He did not appear to see the car. The car was pulled up at once, but it caught the trap and overturned it, and deceased was thrown out and struck his head on the kerb. It

was an unavoidable accident. It appeared that the deceased was surgically attended at the — Hospital, and then removed home. On Monday [November 23rd] he was admitted to the infirmary, where he died from the effects of concussion and laceration of the brain and fracture of the skull. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death."

Miss Raleigh writes :

[*May 3rd, 1904.*]

To the best of my belief Miss H. M. B. and Miss M. B. are truthful, accurate, and careful in their statements. I have always found them so, and they have worked for me for about two years. They related their dreams to me about a fortnight after the death of their brother, but in less detail than in their written account. The main features in the written account correspond with what they told me.

Miss M. B. told me that she has had various similar experiences.

KATHERINE ANN RALEIGH.

It is an interesting question in a case like this whether both percipients received simultaneously telepathic impacts from the external agent, or whether one received it and passed it on to the other, as presumably happens when similar and simultaneous hallucinations or dreams occur without any known corresponding external event to which they can be referred. (For instances, see Chapter IV. below.) A possible conjecture is that both things happen and perhaps fortify each other. If in this particular case, for instance, there had not been a three-cornered telepathic connection between the two percipients and the external agent, it is conceivable that the impressions received might have been less vivid, and perhaps have failed to reach the normal consciousness through the dreams. This is in effect the hypothesis proposed by Gurney in relation to veridical collective hallucinations—see *Phantasms of the Living*, Chap. XVIII., § 7. But for the theory of collective percipience—a most important subject—I may refer the reader to that chapter, and to

Proceedings, Vol. X., Chap. XV., pp. 319-326; also to Myers' *Human Personality*, especially section 648, etc.

The last case has taken us from cases of illness of the agent to one of sudden accident. The next (L. 1221, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 7) is a simple case of a mother having an auditory hallucination of her son calling at the time he received a severe injury. We received it through Mr. F. C. Constable of Wick Court, near Bristol, a Member of the Society. He wrote :

(L. 1221.)

The two statements and letter given below speak for themselves. Dr. Beavis, Mrs. S. Ashley and Miss Dodd,—a daughter of the late Major Dodd,—are all well known to me personally. Miss Dodd's statement was sent me by post. At the time of the accident she was in residence with Mrs. S. Ashley. Mrs. S. Ashley's statement was made by her in my absence. Her endorsement on Miss Dodd's letter was made in my presence.

23rd Oct. 1918.

F. C. CONSTABLE.

Statement of Miss Dodd.

PARSONAGE HOUSE,

LIDDINGTON, NR. SWINDON, Oct. 17th.

DEAR MR. CONSTABLE,—In reply to your note this is as nearly as I remember what passed between Mrs. Ashley and myself on the day Arthur met with his accident. I missed him at his usual dinner hour, but his mother then told me that he did not always come home at that time. After dinner I retired as usual to my little sitting-room and Mrs. Ashley to her duties at the back of the house. In about an hour's time I was surprised to hear her call out, "Is that you Arty?" and getting no reply she came into my room saying "Have you seen anything of Arthur?" I said "No, I have not." She then seemed very surprised, saying, "Well, I heard him call out 'Ma' (a pet name for his mother) as plainly as I have ever heard him, and if that was not his voice I have never

heard it." I remarked that it was very curious, and she then added, "I hope there's nothing the matter with him." Seeing that she was much agitated I tried to soothe her and said, "Oh! he will be home all right presently." This was all we said to each other and Mrs. Ashley then went away, but soon after I heard a knock at the door and some one said, "No answer," then I heard Mrs. Ashley cry out and on going to her to see what had happened she put a letter in my hand which she had just received from the works telling her of her son's accident. I think this is all you will want to know, and hope I have made it plain enough. I may add that I have been much impressed by such a clear premonition¹ of the sad event.

C. A. DODD.

Endorsement on the above by Mrs. Ashley.

I have read this letter and all therein stated is correct. I never heard my son's voice clearer in my life.

M. ASHLEY.

CROFT COTTAGE, WICK,
BRISTOL, Oct. 22nd, 1918.

Mrs. Ashley's own Statement.

At the hour of the accident I distinctly heard the boy call me. I said "Arthur, is that you?" Having no answer I said, "Is that Arthur, Miss Dodd?" She said, "What, is Arthur come home?" I said, "I distinctly heard him call me. I do hope nothing has happened to him." She said, "I hope not."

On Friday afternoon, Sept. 6th, at 3.30, I was in the back kitchen wiping my hands. Both back and front doors were open; it was about 3.30 the accident happened, and the distance is about 1 mile from the house.

M. ASHLEY.

CROFT COTTAGE, WICK,
BRISTOL, Oct. 17th, 1918.

¹ Mr. Constable informs us, in reply to enquiries, that he has "not the slightest doubt [Miss Dodd] used the term 'premonition' merely for 'abnormal occurrence.'"—that is not as implying that Mrs. Ashley's experience preceded the accident.

Statement by Dr. Beavis, Manager of the works where the accident occurred.

WICK, NEAR BRISTOL, Oct. 23rd, 1918.

The accident happened at about 4 p.m. on Sept. 6th. I myself took the lad, whose right arm was crushed, to the hospital at Cosham, and he remained conscious from the time of the accident up to the time of my handing him over to the hospital authorities.

CHARLES BEAVIS.

The following case (L. 1193, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 342) connected with the loss of the *Titanic* was sent to us by Miss Alice L. Head, an Associate of the Society, who requested that, in printing it, the names and addresses of the persons concerned, except her own, should be omitted. Pseudonyms have therefore been substituted. The experience seems to have been a "vision" somewhat resembling that of Miss Paterson (L. 1207, see above, p. 243). Miss Head wrote :

(L. 1193.)

26, LEINSTER SQUARE,
BAYSWATER, W., July 4, 1912.

I have lately heard of a well authenticated case of telepathy.

A friend who is at present living with us, Miss Margaret Simpson, lost her brother in the wreck of the *Titanic*. This brother had had for some time past a post on board one of the other vessels of the White Star line, but he had been compelled to resign it on account of illness.

Just before the *Titanic* sailed he had the offer of a similar post on board the fated ship, which he accepted at the last moment.

The fact of his having done so was known to Miss Margaret Simpson, but *not* to a married sister, Mrs. Henderson, who lives in Vancouver.

On April 19 [1912] Mrs. Henderson wrote in a letter to

Miss Emma Simpson (another sister living at Clifton) the following account :

"I was busy in the afternoon after lunch on Tuesday, April 16, and I saw Bessie and Nina crying and clinging to one another. I seemed to be in a kind of dream and yet I was wide awake and had not even been thinking of them."

Bessie and Nina are the wife and child of Mr. Simpson who was drowned.

In reply to questions by Miss Margaret Simpson, Mrs. Henderson wrote again on June 13 :

"You asked me about seeing Bessie and Nina ; I was alone in the house, and they seemed to appear to me in a sort of mist ; I could not see their faces. Had I been thinking of them at the time, I could understand it, but I was busy after lunch.

"I did not know anything about Willie's illness then, or that he was on the *Titanic*, but I had no doubt that it was Bessie and Nina that I saw. I told Cissy and Daisy about it that evening (April 16th, 1912)."

I have myself seen the letters from which these extracts are copied.

The news of the wreck, which took place on [the night of April 14-15, 1912], was known in England on Tuesday 16th, and also in Vancouver. ALICE L. HEAD.

To this account the signature of Miss Margaret Simpson was added in corroboration.

From the account given it seems probable that at the time of her vision Mrs. Henderson had just heard of the wreck of the *Titanic*, as the news of it reached Vancouver that day. But she did not know her brother was on board, and therefore had no reason to associate his wife and daughter with the loss.

There is a curious case (L. 989, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 108) in which, apparently between sleeping and waking, Mr. Shrubsole in England sees his son twice over in positions more or less veridical at the actual time (as he

believed) when the son met with a serious accident on board ship in the Pacific Ocean. I do not quote it because the evidence for the time coincidence is defective. It was some weeks before news was received of the accident, and no note of the date of the apparition or dream had been made. Moreover, the fullest account of the experience (we have two) was not written within our limit of five years. The earlier account seems to have been written about seven months after the event.

The remaining experiences corresponding to accidents happening to the agent are undoubtedly dreams. The first I will quote (L. 992, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 125) occurred on the night after the accident, and is a good example of dream dramatisation, with the dreamer playing an important part. There is too much correspondence with fact to be easily attributed to chance, but, as will be seen, the accident was in the dream connected with the wrong sister, and the dream representation of it was otherwise incorrect.

(L. 992.)

Miss C. Clarkson writes :

ALVERTHORPE HALL, WAKEFIELD, *May 8th*, 1894.

On Sunday, May 5th, 1894,¹ my sister and I were boating on the river Derwent, in Yorkshire (near Kirkham Abbey) with a party of friends in a small steam launch. Between three and four o'clock in the afternoon, we had all landed to gather cowslips in the fields, and on returning to the boat, for some reason the usual plank for landing was not in position, and we jumped in turn from the bank on to the flat end of the boat. I was the last, and in jumping missed my footing and slipped into the water, catching the edge of the boat however with my hands as I went, and supporting myself—so that I was not totally immersed, though the water was a good depth where we were. Two of the gentlemen rushed forward and pulled me out by my arms. I said as I was being

¹ The first Sunday in May 1894 was really the 6th.

hauled up, "It is no use pulling so hard, you hurt me." One of them said "We *must* pull, if we are to get you out." I was got on to the boat in a very short time, and was never in any danger.

We returned to our own home the next day, and never mentioned in the slightest way the little accident to any one, lest my father, who is a very old man, should be alarmed or worried at what had happened. Shortly after we returned, my step-mother said to *my sister*, "Have you had an accident on the river?" "I? No," said my sister. "Because," continued my step-mother, "I had a very distressing dream about you last night—I dreamt you fell into the river, and I was in the boat and got hold of your hair, and tried to pull you out. You said, 'Don't pull so hard, you hurt me.' I said, 'You had better be hurt than drowned.'"

Then, and not till then, did we tell her that one of us really had had an accident precisely as she had dreamed, but that her dream had made a mistake in the identity of the sisters.

According to my step-mother's account, my father also seemed to have been a little anxious and uneasy in his sleep that night, and in the morning rather pointedly asked her if she had dreamt anything, but said nothing further; and nothing was afterwards said to him to make him aware of what had happened. My step-mother's dream was during the night after the accident occurred.

CHRISTABEL CLARKSON.

Miss Clarkson adds :

I have asked Mrs. Clarkson if she ever had any other dreams of the kind, but she says not.

She enclosed the following accounts from Mrs. Clarkson and her sister.

May 14th, 1894.

On Sunday night, May 6th, 1894, [I had] a dream which appeared remarkable; in effect, was this,—that Louisa Clarkson was in the water apparently drowned, and I said, "Take care, or you will go," and pulled her

in by her hair. Her answer was, "Do not pull so hard, you hurt me." I still pulled, saying, "You had better be hurt than drowned." The following day, on her return home, I enquired of her if she had an accident during her visit. She said, "Well, something like one; my sister got into the water and used just the same words, 'Don't pull so hard, you hurt me.'" Her answer to me was, "Well, it is strange."

ANNIE PILKINGTON CLARKSON.

P.S.—I enquired of Louisa before hearing a word of the accident.

May 14th, 1894.

Very soon after my sister and I returned from our river expedition on the 7th of May, my step-mother came to me and said, "Have you had any accident while you have been away?" I replied, "I? No." She then said, "Because I had such a strange dream about you last night," relating the circumstances, and repeating the very words my sister had used and those used to her by the gentleman who got her out of the water. I then said it was very strange, because my sister had had exactly such an accident as she had dreamt. No one except those who had been with us in the boat knew a word of the accident.

LOUISA CLARKSON.

The next case (L. 1165, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 136) was sent by Mr. Marshall Wait of Chicago, an Associate of the American Branch, who collected the evidence. He was acquainted with the agent, Dr. W. G. Porter, and two of the witnesses, Mr. and Mrs. Millner.

(L. 1165.)

He wrote on January 28, 1901 :

Mr. Millner told me of the dreams very soon after their occurrence, and intended to procure the statements for me at once, but Mrs. Porter's husband died very suddenly a short time after, and as she was already in a nervous condition from recent illness, Mr. Millner was unwilling to trouble her about the matter until recently.

Mrs. Porter writes :

No. 299, CEYLON AVE., CHICAGO, *Jany.* 19, 1901.

On the evening of October 7, 1899, my daughter, Mrs. Millner, and her husband went down town to see the bicycle parade, leaving me at home with the children. While they were gone I dreamed a very distressing dream about my son Guy [Dr. W. G. Porter] (who was living in Kalamazoo), in which I saw him hurt in some way. When I woke the details of the dream were indistinct in my memory, but the painful impression was very strong, although I am not a believer in dreams, and am accustomed to pay no attention to them.

When Mr. and Mrs. Millner returned about 11 o'clock, I mentioned to Mrs. Millner that I had had "such a miserable dream about Guy," telling her the particulars as far as I remembered them. A few nights after I again dreamed of my son, and this time I distinctly saw him drawn out of a crowd of people and badly cut. This dream I also told to Mrs. Millner before its verification. The next morning I received a letter from my son, by which I learned that he had come to Chicago on the day of the bicycle parade and had met with a painful accident, being badly cut about the head; that he had gone to the house of a physician of his acquaintance, where his wounds were dressed, and that as his head was covered with bandages, he had returned to Kalamazoo without coming to see me, fearing to shock me, as I had recently been in poor health.

Mrs. Millner signs this with me in attestation of the fact that I told her of my dreams before their verification.

K. B. PORTER.

MYRA B. MILLNER.

Mr. Marshall Wait wrote on Feb. 20, 1901.

The letters which passed between Dr. Porter and his mother have been destroyed, but I have succeeded in establishing a little closer time relation between the accident and the first dream. Mrs. Porter authorises me to say

that she remembers that Mr. and Mrs. Millner came home that evening a little after eleven, and that she had been in bed but a short time when they came, so that the dream occurred between ten and eleven o'clock, and certainly not before ten. You will see by the enclosed letter of Dr. Porter that he fixes the accident at very near ten o'clock. . . .

MARSHALL WAIT.

Dr. Porter's statement was as follows :

2057, WILCOX AVE., CHICAGO, ILL., *Feb. 6th, 1901.*

To whom it may concern :

On October 7th, 1899, I left Kalamazoo, Michigan, about 4.30 p.m. over the Michigan Central R. R., arriving in Chicago, Ill., at 8 o'clock. I took a hack from the depot, intending to drive to the Briggs Hotel. Our progress was stopped near State and Madison Streets, by the crowd attending the bicycle parade of the Street Carnival then in progress. Owing to the intense jam I was forced to remain at the corner of State and Madison Streets until after the parade had passed. When the crowd broke up there was a severe crush, during which I lost my footing and was trampled, sustaining severe injuries about the head. I wandered about the city in a dazed condition a considerable portion of the night, and at five o'clock the following morning found myself on the north side, several miles from where I was hurt. I inquired for and was directed to the residence of Dr. Nicholas Senn, the surgeon, who sent me to St. Joseph's Hospital, where my wounds were dressed at 9 o'clock. I passed the next day at a hotel (the Briggs House) and did not communicate with my relatives, fearing lest my bad appearance and bandaged head might prove a shock to my mother, who was in a very low physical condition at the time. I returned to Kalamazoo on the following afternoon, and was in bed about two weeks. On my partial recovery I wrote my mother of the accident in response to a letter from her, in which she stated that she had a dream on the night of the 7th of October,

to the effect that I was hurt and in trouble. This letter to my mother was the first actual knowledge she had either of my trip to Chicago or my injury. I also understand from her that she had another dream the night before she received my letter, in which she saw me drawn from a crowd wounded and bleeding.

My injuries consisted of severe cuts and bruises on the face and neck, which bled freely. I sustained a slight concussion of the brain, which was overcome by two weeks of quiet.

My trip to Chicago was made suddenly and without notification to any of my relatives or friends. My mother's first dream coincided with the date on which I was hurt, and her second dream coincided with the day on which my letter to her was mailed. She received it, I believe, the following day.

WM. G. PORTER, M.D.

Mr. Wait also obtained corroboration from Mr. Millner as follows :

CHICAGO, ILL.

I heard of both of Mrs. Porter's dreams of her son's accident before their verification from my wife, but not from Mrs. Porter herself.

LE ROY MILLNER.

Dr. Porter wrote to Mr. Wait on Feb. 19, 1901.

DEAR SIR,—Answering your letter of yesterday as to time of the accident, it is a fact that the end of the parade had passed me by 10 o'clock. The crowd immediately broke up, and it was then I was hurt. Of course, I did not pay any attention to details at the time, but it is safe to assert that the accident to me occurred within a few minutes of 10 p.m.—Yours respectfully,

W. G. PORTER.

Three other cases of dreams corresponding with accidents I will describe briefly.

In the first (L. 1113, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 104) a child, Lily Spruit, dreamt of the sinking of the *Atacama*, of

which her father was captain, and of his being saved, he and the crew having taken to the boats. The coincidence was striking, the ship having gone down that night, but the value of the evidence is weakened by the fact, which came out in a trial later, that the ship was known to be unseaworthy by the owners and by the captain (who had been promised a bonus on his salary), and therefore possibly by his family. The dream was told to the child's mother immediately after its occurrence, but was not recorded till a week later, after Captain Spruit had returned home.

The second case (L. 1118, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 151) comes from Professor Alexander of Rio de Janeiro. Dona Marie do Carmo Blum had a confused dream on the night (as she believes) of April 27, 1899, that Dr. Garnier, who was her medical attendant when she lived at a distant town, had fallen in alighting from a carriage and been much hurt. This dream, which disturbed her a good deal, she related to her husband, but it was not recorded till about six weeks later, when it had been learnt that Dr. Garnier had had such an accident on April 27 in jumping from his carriage to try to stop some runaway horses, and had suffered from concussion of the brain. There was some doubt whether the date of the dream was remembered independently.

In the third case (L. 1178, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 155) the dream coincided not with an accident, but with a friend's great anxiety lest there had been one. Miss G. dreamt of her friend Mrs. L. coming to her in motor costume and in great distress, and then, confusedly, of her being distressed because her husband had gone away. Mr. L. and two friends had gone out motoring that evening; the motor had broken down a long way from home; it was impossible to communicate with Mrs. L., and they did not get home till two o'clock in the morning. Mrs. L. had been in great distress and anxiety, and had wished for Miss G. to help her. The record is dated about a year after the event. It is doubtful whether this case is best classed here or with those to which I now pass.

§ 3. *Coincidence with ideas or wishes connected by the agent with the percipient.*

In this section are put together hallucinations and dramatic dreams which seem to be causally connected with a mental condition or idea in the agent, associated by the latter with the percipient—either a desire for the percipient's presence or information to be conveyed to him. It must be admitted, however, that in some of the cases to be quoted the agent's part is somewhat conjectural.

One of the most striking instances of this kind in the collection is L. 1227 (*Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 83). It appeared in the *Westminster Cathedral Chronicle* for March 1919, and we are indebted to the Editor for permission to print it. The names and addresses of all those concerned have been given to us, but are withheld by request. The case may be best classed as one of telepathic transference to the percipient of the agent's great desire that he should visit her. The percipient's experience took the form that an actual sick call might have done, and was taken by him at the time to be a waking experience. But whether it really was so is doubtful. It was on the line between sleeping and waking, and it is impossible to say whether it was a vivid dream that woke the percipient or whether he woke to see and hear an apparition. It is perhaps most probable that it was both, and that the dream which woke him persisted for some seconds as a waking hallucination.

The report in the *Westminster Cathedral Chronicle*, slightly abbreviated, ran as follows :

(L. 1227.)

One afternoon a short time back Fr. Brompton (to give the priest a fictitious name) was requested to visit a lady who was ill. When he arrived at her house he met the doctor, who very urgently requested him not to administer the last rites at that particular moment, but to be satisfied with giving the patient a few cheering words. He very reluctantly consented, but, when he saw the

lady, greatly regretted his promise and the fact that the doctor should have made such a request, as he feared that the patient was very much worse than he had been made to understand. However, his promise had been given; so he arranged that he would come again in the morning and administer the Last Sacraments. Before he left the house, however, he gave the nurse his telephone number and asked her to telephone should the patient become suddenly worse before the morning.

As usual, that night the telephone was switched on to one of the Fathers' rooms, as is the custom at the Oratory, with a view to any possible sick-calls. Fr. Brompton retired to bed at his usual hour after reciting his rosary, in which he did not forget to include his patient of the afternoon. In the early morning he was startled out of a deep sleep by his bedroom door opening, and saw, by the light of the moon through his open, uncovered window, a medium-sized, dark-robed figure standing by it, and understood the person to say something about a sick-call.

"For heaven's sake, man," he hastily answered, sitting up in bed and rubbing his eyes, not quite sure if it was the Father on duty, or the lodge porter, "speak clearly."

"Be quick!" came the reply in clearer tones. "There is no time to lose. There is a telephone message."

"Right—right you are!" at once answered Fr. Brompton. The word "telephone" brought back in a moment to his mind the sick-call of the previous afternoon, and it did not therefore occur to him to ask for the address. He sprang out of bed—the door closed as he did so. Turning on the light, he observed that it was just on the quarter to four. He quickly dressed, and went to the chapel for the Holy Oils and the Blessed Sacrament, remarking, by the way, on the forgetfulness of his caller to turn on the light for him. Making his way swiftly across the space between the house and the gates that shut it off from the main road, he found them locked as they should be, and had to knock up the lodge porter to let him out. Within a minute or two he was well on his way to the house he had visited the previous afternoon, and as he

waited after his first ring at the bell and congratulated himself on his smart arrival, he looked at his watch and saw that it still wanted five minutes to four. He rang again—and again. . . . A clock in the vicinity chimed the hour. He rang and knocked. “Strange that there is no one ready to answer the door after telephoning,” he thought. In the stillness of the moonlight night he thought he was making enough noise to wake the dead. The dead! Could the worst have happened? His regret of yesterday came upon him with sudden force, so that he became alarmed. He banged at the door. The electric light was on in the hall and on the stairs, as he could see. He knew that there were only six people in the house—the sick lady in one room, her husband, given up as hopeless, in another, two day nurses (now evidently in a sound sleep), and the two night nurses in attendance on the patients. The children had all safely recovered from influenza and had been taken elsewhere. . . . A clock chimed the quarter past. At last, to the priest’s great relief, the door opened.

“Come in, doctor,” said a nurse; “I fear you have been kept waiting.”

“I am not the doctor; I’m a priest.”

“Oh, I suppose they telephoned for you? That’s bad news. Will you go up?”

Fr. Brompton made his way up to the sick-room, and as he quietly entered he saw the nurse kneeling by the bedside and noticed that she was very startled as he entered. He also heard the sick person saying: “I do wish Fr. Brompton would come.” Afterwards he learned that for the space of about half an hour before his arrival the lady had been expressing a wish to see him. The nurse, not being a Catholic, and not realising that a priest would come outside the ordinary hours, suggested that she should recite some prayers from a Catholic prayer-book. Fr. Brompton arrived while she was doing this. He at once gave the lady the Last Sacraments, much to her relief and peace of mind. Within an hour or two she became unconscious. After reciting the prayers for the dying, the priest prepared to leave the house.

"Thank you so much for coming so opportunely," said the nurse, "but you quite startled me."

"On the contrary, thanks are due to you for telephoning."

"Oh, but I didn't!"

"Well, someone did. I expect it was Mrs. ——'s sister."

As the nurses were not Catholics, the priest took it that one of the lady's relations had telephoned in her anxiety about her sister. Fr. Brompton heard that she died a few hours later. She became a Catholic at the age of eighteen, and had been an excellent one up to her pious death at the age of thirty-two.

In the evening of the same day, Fr. Brompton had occasion to speak to the Father whose duty it had been to answer the telephone, and in the course of conversation said :

"By the way, I'm sorry I spoke to you so sharply last night."

"Why, when do you mean?"

"When you came to call me."

"But *I never called you last night!*"

"My dear Father, you came to my room at a quarter to four this morning and told me there was a telephone sick-call."

"I never left my room last night. I had a sleepless night and happened to note that I was awake at that very time, as I had my light on. And what is more, *there was no telephone call last night!*"

In the above story it should be borne in mind that Fr. Brompton had had no reason, up to the moment he spoke to the Father responsible for the night telephone, to suppose that anything unusual had happened. He had had a sick-call in the afternoon and would return the following morning in the ordinary way. He mentioned the sick person in his prayers as was his wont in such cases. He made no special preparations before going to bed. He was awakened by his door being suddenly opened. He took the caller to be the Father on duty, and were it not that he knew it could not have been

the lodge porter, would not have spoken to the Father at all. It was only because he considered he had spoken roughly to him when, as he presumed, he had called him, that he referred to the matter at all when speaking to him on other business. On enquiry at the telephone exchange it was stated that there was no record of any call for the Oratory on the night in question.

In reply to our request Father Brompton and Father X. (the priest in charge of the telephone) kindly corroborated the above report thus :

1. The above narrative correctly states my being called by Father [X.] in the early morning of November 22nd, 1918.
[FATHER BROMPTON.]

2. I neither had a telephone call, nor did I visit Father [Brompton's] room in the early morning of November 22nd, 1918.
[FATHER X.]

We were also able to get in touch with the nurse who was on duty in the sick woman's room on the night in question, and obtained from her the following corroborative statement :

I did not telephone or send for Father [Brompton].
M. A. W.

In reply to a further question concerning the nature of his experience Father Brompton wrote :

March 21st, 1919.

You ask me whether the manner of my being called was a unique experience. There was nothing unique to me in the manner of the call, it came like dozens of other sick-calls ; but what was, and is a unique experience to me is the denial of the person who called me.

[FATHER BROMPTON.]

It is of some interest in connexion with this case that about a fortnight after the death of the agent she purported to communicate through Mrs. Leonard, the sitter being a lady who was not acquainted with her and did not know of her death. Particulars are given in the *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 226.

There are two cases in which the agent's desire to call the percipient is translated into an auditory hallucination. The first (L. 1143, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 14) came from an Associate of the Society, Mr. Clissold, and was sent to us, enclosed in a letter dated September 20, 1904, by the late Colonel Taylor, then a Member of the S.P.R. Council, to whom Mr. Clissold and his daughter had been known for some years.

(L. 1143.)

Mr. Clissold writes :

RAVENSWORTH, CHELTENHAM,
September 14th, 1904.

On Saturday, September 10th, I was in my daughter's garden pruning some trees. I had just completed my work about 7 p.m. when I distinctly heard my daughter's voice calling me, "——— when are you coming down?" using a familiar name by which no one but she addresses me. I looked all round me and could see no one, so I called to her several times, but receiving no answer supposed that she had called me and then gone home.

However, when I got to the bottom of the garden, a distance of about 40 yards from where I was pruning, I found her at work among her flowers, and on asking her why she had called me, she said, "I never called you at all, but I was thinking of you very much a short time ago and thought I must call you, but I did not." It is perfectly certain that I heard her voice distinctly, and it is equally certain that my daughter did not call me. I write this simple account as it may be possible that other people may have met with occurrences of a similar nature. Is it within the bounds of probability that thought can, under certain conditions, be transferred into audible sound?

E. M. CLISSOLD.

Mr. Clissold's daughter writes :

ROCK HOUSE, FOWNHOPE, HEREFORD.

On Saturday, September 10th, I was tying up chrysanthemums near our house and father was pruning trees about 40 yards from where I was working, but out of

sight. I kept on thinking I would call him to come down, as he had not been well in the morning, and I was afraid he would be over tired, but I knew he hated to be worried. For about half an hour I thought of nothing else but whether I should call him or not, and suddenly I saw him just above me, and he said, "Why did you call me?" I said, "I did not call you, but for some time I have been thinking of doing so." If I had called him, I should not have made use of the familiar name he said I used, as I knew the gardener was working close by. My husband went up since, and stood listening at the exact spot where my father stood. I called as loud as I could to him from the spot where I was working when my father heard me call him, and he could only hear me faintly; he was expecting it and listening for the call. My father was pruning at the time and not expecting to be called, and he is also a little deaf. I enclose a section of the ground showing our positions and the intervening features of the ground. ALICE PURDON.

The section referred to shows a number of terraces, rising one above another, terminated by walls covered with ivy, between Mr. Clissold and his daughter. Mr. Clissold was at the far end of the highest terrace, and his daughter on the lowest, at a level of 38 feet below where he was standing, and at a distance of 124 feet measured horizontally from a point 38 feet vertically below him. Supposing, therefore, that she had unconsciously uttered her thought aloud, it seems quite impossible that he should have heard it.

The second case of the kind (L. 1177, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 143) also came from an Associate, now a Corresponding Member, of the Society, Mr. Severin Lauritzen.

(L. 1177.)

He writes :

HOLTE, DENMARK, *May 5, 1909.*

I live in a villa in the country, and in a neighbouring villa lives my married daughter, who is named Evelyn. There is only a distance of 33 steps, or say some 22

yards, in a straight line, between the houses. I have a telephone from a central station in my house, and also a short private telephone that connects the two houses. I commence writing this 1.20 p.m., May 5th. The same day about 1 o'clock my son-in-law, K., telephoned from his place of business in the town to my house to say that he wanted to speak with Evelyn. It was my wife who answered the telephone when K. called, and when she heard what he wanted she immediately pressed the button of the private telephone to summon E. Just before this moment E. heard her mother's very clear and distinct voice call "Evelyn, Evelyn." She arose from her writing desk where she sat absorbed in household accounts, opened the door to the hall in her house, and asked Miss N., who was working there, "Did mother call?" "No," said Miss N., "Nobody called." E. said: "Yes, she did call." Then she turned to go back to an open window in the room where she had been writing, to see if her mother was outside there; but she did not reach the window before she heard the private telephone bell sounding, so she turned again and went straight to my house without answering the call per telephone. Passing the telephone and Miss N., she said, "There, you see, mother called." Arrived at my house, she found that her husband wanted to speak with her. Just as she had finished her conversation with her husband I came out from an adjacent room to speak with her, but she interrupted me and said, "Now we have a clear case of telepathy."

The account is countersigned by Mr. Lauritzen's wife and daughter, and Miss N. Mr. Lauritzen proceeds to give at some length the reasons, including experiments, for certainty that his daughter could not have heard her name called even if her mother had called her, which she did not, and that the call she heard preceded the telephone bell. This evidence, important though it is, I omit for the sake of shortness.

There is another case resembling these, though the sound heard was not vocal but a bell, and the agent's

desire was not directed to any particular percipient (L. 993, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 162). A lady fainting in her bedroom when staying with friends had a strong desire to ring for assistance, but was unable to do so. Nevertheless the bell was heard and assistance came. She cannot have unknowingly rung, for there was, it appeared, no bell pull in her room. I only describe the case thus briefly because unfortunately the accounts we have from agent and percipient were not written till four years after the event, and some discrepancies between them in details show that there is haziness of memory somewhere.

There are two cases in which the apparent agent is approaching the percipient who has an experience—in one case an auditory hallucination and in the other a dream—suggesting the agent's approach.

The first (L. 1222, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 30) we heard of from Miss E. Arkwright, in whose family the percipient, Mr. Saunders, had been gardener. In reply to questions a substantially similar account was afterwards sent by Mr. Saunders himself, enclosed with a corroborative account by his granddaughter, Maud, dated October 14, 1918. Mr. Saunders's account is as follows :

(L. 1222.)

“On the 8th of January [1918] about 7 a.m. I heard four words distinctly as I lay in bed: ‘Tom’s coming to-day.’ I asked Maud and her mother if either had been in the room. They answered in the negative. I told them what I had heard. They thought I must have been dreaming. There it ended till the unexpected Tom turned up between 9 and 10 a.m. on the same day.

My health was good at the time, before and after.
Age 84.

JAMES SAUNDERS.”

Mr. Saunders's grandson Tom was serving with the army in France and obtained leave quite unexpectedly. No evidence from him as to his feelings at the time has been obtained.

The second case (L. 1225, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 56) was sent by the dreamer, Mrs. Hanson, an Associate of

the Society. She dreamt the dream at least twice in the same night, which is an unusual experience. She writes :

(L. 1225.)

PLEASANCE COTTAGE, DORMAN'S PARK,
NR. EAST GRINSTEAD, *January 7, 1919.*

Since the summer of 1915 I have, first personally and later through the Prisoners of War Care Committee, been sending regular parcels to Lance-Corporal W. D——, Royal Scots Fusiliers Regiment, prisoner first at Döberitz and later at Guben, Brandenburg.

I do not know the man or his family personally, and heard of him through a friend who was interesting herself in the British Prisoners. Apart from occasional postcards thanking me for the parcels, and two photographs and a group taken at the Prison, I have had no other correspondence with the man. Since the Armistice I have naturally awaited with interest any news that I might receive from him. I was away for Xmas, and as I had heard nothing from him I began to wonder if he was all right, and determined on my return to write to his wife and ask her if she had received any news.

I had a good deal of correspondence to get through, and put off writing until Sunday, Jan. 5th. The previous night (Sat. Jan. 4th) I had a very vivid dream twice repeated, in fact I could be almost sure it came three times, but of twice I am certain. In the dream I was with my husband in some strange place talking to L.-C. D——. We shook hands with him, and he said he was safe home. He was dressed in a dark uniform similar to that of one of the photographs he sent me. In the morning (Jan. 5th) when I woke up I told my husband, and also the maid when she came to wake us. I enclose both their statements to this effect. The impression left by the dream was so vivid that I did not write to Mrs. D——, thinking I would wait a day or two longer in case I might hear of her husband's arrival. This morning (Jan. 7th) I received a p.c. which I also enclose, dated by postmark Jan. 5th, from L./C. D——

saying he had just arrived at Leith. Therefore when I was dreaming that he was safely home he must have nearly reached Leith. . . .

I am not in the habit of dreaming much, and seldom remember my dreams, and only once before, a good many years ago, have I ever had anything of interest in this way.

M. R. HANSON.

Corroborative statements were enclosed from Mrs. Hanson's husband and from her maid. These are printed in the *Journal*.

The postcard to which Mrs. Hanson refers in her statement has an Edinburgh postmark, dated 4 p.m., January 5, 1919. It reads :

I have just landed at Leith, and am going on to
Prisoners of War Reception Camp,
South Camp,
Ripon.

[Signed] L./C. W. D.—
R.S.F.

It appears, therefore, as Mrs. Hanson says, that at the time of her dream, the night of January 4-5, 1919, Lance-Corporal D—— was approaching Leith. The intention of sending a postcard to Mrs. Hanson may well have been in his mind at the time, since he despatched it immediately on his arrival. It may even have been already written. And similarly Tom Saunders may well have been thinking of his grandfather about the time of the latter's hallucination, since he was within about two hours of reaching his home. But in neither case have we direct evidence on the matter.

In the next case (L. 1135, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 177) the percipient dreamt what the agent had in mind and was about to communicate to her, only in the dream there were as usual dramatic additions. It is another case which we owe to Mr. F. C. Constable.

(L. 1135.)

The first letter was written to Mr. Constable's cook, Miss Julia Cox, by her sister, Mrs. Hope, as follows :

49, MAYBRICK ROAD,

[Postmark, "BATH, 10 p.m., *April 1.03.*"]

MY DEAR SISTER,—I am sending you the copy from the Bible which I hope will be all right. I hope you will not mind my not coming down, but if this is not satisfactory let me know and I will come and bring the Bible with me. I shall come down after Easter without fail if all is well. It was very strange, but I dreamt Monday night [apparently the night of March 30th] that you came here and wanted the Bible, as you thought you would take greater care of it than I. I had told Bob about my dream before I had your letter. . . .

[Signed] F. HOPE.

In answer to Mr. Constable's request for corroboration, Mr. Hope wrote to him :

49, MAYBRICK ROAD, OLDFIELD PARK.

[Postmark, "BATH,"] *April 6 [1903].*

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your request with reference to my wife's dream, I hereby state that my wife had gone to the theatre with a friend. On going to the front door I looked behind as I sometimes do, to see if there were any letters. I found one from my wife's sister, Julia. As we had received one from her only a day or two before, I thought something must be the matter, so I opened it and found it was a request from her for particulars of her birth entry in a family Bible. I hunted about and found it in a box of old books that had come from the old home. When my wife came in she saw the Bible, and said as soon as she got inside the door, "What have you got that old Bible for? I was dreaming about it last night. I dreamed that Julia wanted it to get her birth entry from it." I had not had even a chance to speak to her before she got that out, nor had

she seen the letter, because I had put it behind the tea-box on the mantel-shelf where we usually put our letters after reading them.

I was so much struck with the remarkable coincidence that I told my fellow-workmen about it in the morning.

[Signed] R. H. HOPE.

P.S.—I forgot to say that Julia's letter got destroyed by accident. . . . R. H. H.

Mr. Constable writes, enclosing this letter :

WICK COURT, NEAR BRISTOL, 7th April, 1903.

. . . I think (from what I hear, not what I know) that Mr. Hope's statement is accurate, and his wife's not so accurate—if, as I think, there is contradiction. But these letters show how utterly untrustworthy human memory is *in detail*. But memory as to general truth I would suggest is trustworthy. For instance, in this case something *did* occur which struck those concerned as exceptional.

F. C. CONSTABLE.

The following statement was written by Mrs. Constable, from Miss Cox's dictation, and signed as correct by the latter :

WICK COURT, NEAR BRISTOL.

I went to Bath on a Saturday and returned on a Tuesday in March. I do not remember the exact day. I did not know then that I should want the register of my birth, and did not talk about the entry in the Bible at all.

I have read what is stated here and it is quite true.

JULIA COX.

Mrs. Constable adds :

10th April, 1903.

From notes in my possession I know that Miss Cox (my cook) went to Bath on Saturday, March 14th, and returned on the following Tuesday, March 17th, 1903.

LOUISA CONSTABLE.

Mr. Constable writes, enclosing the above, and explaining the circumstances further :

April 10th, 1903.

Julia Cox invested through me some money in an annuity. I thought she had better get at once an acknowledgment from the office that her birth was rightly declared and so, after her visit to Bath on the 14th March, told her to get a copy of the entry in the Bible.

Mr. Constable writes later :

April 13th, 1903.

Mrs. Hope is here to spend the day with Julia Cox. She has just now told me :

“I dreamt on the Monday night Julia came to me for the Bible. She said she wanted a copy of her register. What amazed me was she said she could take better care of the Bible than I could. On Tuesday I went to the theatre and when I came back about half-past ten there was my husband and the Bible on the table. I told him of my dream and he said he had a letter from Julia asking for her register. It was very funny. Oh, yes! It seemed just a dream.”

Her statement that it was “just a dream” was in answer to my question. I thought the impression might have been stronger than an ordinary dream.

To a further question Mrs. Hope adds :—“I have had dreams before of little matters that have come true, but none so real as that one.”

F. C. CONSTABLE.

We cannot tell in this case whether the letter from Miss Cox to her sister had been written before Mrs. Hope dreamt of its contents. And the same is true of the following case (L. 1189, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 263), where the dream of facts, unknown and unlikely, was confirmed some days later by a letter describing them. Here, however, the writer of the letter does not appear to have figured in the dream, and it is not very probable that he wrote it earlier than two days after the dream. The assumption that he was the agent is, therefore, highly

conjectural, depending on his having had the letter in mind some days before he wrote, or at least posted, it. The dreamer, here called Mrs. "Barnard" (pseudonym), had five days earlier had an interesting reciprocal dream (see below, L. 1188, p. 415) at a time of considerable anxiety and trouble about illness of her children.

In the letter of February 21, 1912, quoted below with L. 1188, Mrs. Barnard also writes :

(L. 1189.)

Another curious dream happened last Friday [Feb. 16]. I dreamed my aunt Miss R. was being pulled up and down in a lift; the lift was not painted and looked like zinc. Miss W. was pulling her up and down. My mother told me it was silly of Miss W. to try to do it, she nearly had an accident the week before; she hoped neither I nor Uncle J. would ever pull her up.

I have not seen this aunt for fourteen years; I never hear from her. She is living in a hut in the New Forest, which is built on the ground floor. Miss W. . . . I have not seen for twenty years. Now I told D. [Mr. Barnard] about it and he made great fun of a lift being wanted on a ground floor house. Monday [Feb. 19] Uncle J. writes: "Your aunt has had built a sky parlor and has a lift to pull her up and down. Miss W. is now living with her and can manage the lift, which went quite wrong last week."

The letter from the uncle, Mr. R., was not preserved, but Mr. Barnard corroborates Mrs. Barnard's statement in a communication received by us on April 2, 1912. He writes :

L. [Mrs. Barnard] told me of the dream of the lift two days before Mr. R.'s letter came. I chaffed her about requiring a lift on a ground floor. Two days afterwards Mr. R.'s letter came, which she showed me with great triumph.

Owing to various circumstances it has not been possible to obtain any information as to whether Mrs. Barnard's impression in regard to the appearance of the lift was correct.

Whether or not the letter in the last two cases had anything to do with the percipient's experience, there is a curious little group of cases in which the letter itself does seem, at least at first sight, to affect the dream in some way. The dream not only conveys information contained in the letter, but is apparently timed by its arrival or approach. A striking case is L. 1133, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 138. It was sent to us by Mr. A. H. Atkins of 3 Clarendon Park, Torquay, with some other apparently telepathic experiences that had occurred in his family. The first document I shall quote was written by the dreamer, Miss Edith Atkins, to her parents on October 27th, 1902.

(L. 1133.)

October 27th, 1902.

. . . Talking about dreams, Sophie [Niederhauser's] letter adds one to the very curious list of coincidences in this respect, to wit:—I had not thought or heard anything of Alice Birman or Smith as she is now since her marriage; I only knew she was married to a man named Smith about two years ago. Well, Friday night I dreamt I met her with her husband, and she seemed to be in a flourishing condition, both exceedingly well dressed; they were staying at a hotel in the place where we met them, where it was I don't know, and they were going to some exhibition or other. I remarked to Ma in my dream, she being with me, "Alice seems to have done well, she has just the same ideas as before." There endeth my dream; I woke up, dressed, and went downstairs Saturday morning, where I found a letter from Sophie awaiting me, and almost at the outset of her letter she informs me that Alice and her husband called on them suddenly last Saturday week. [Here follows a description of the letter, for a copy of which see the next document.] While reading this epistle it seemed to me that I was reading something I already knew quite well. Rather a remarkable coincidence, that! I am going to give Sophie a description of her husband as I saw him in the dream, and I quite expect it will tally with that of the real man.

The next document is a translation (from the French) of an extract (of which a copy was sent us) from Miss Niederhauser's letter dated from Aarau, Switzerland, October 23rd, 1902.

On Sunday I had visitors from England—can you guess whom? Alice Birman—now Mrs. Smith—with her husband. They came here quite unexpectedly and as we have only one bed for visitors, they were obliged to go to the hotel. They took tea with us at four o'clock but dined at the hotel. They came at ten o'clock on Saturday evening and went away at nine on Monday morning. For a long time I had heard nothing of Alice.

Alice has three servants in her household—a cook, a housemaid, and a nurse. Mr. Smith does not speak German; he is an agreeable man, so gentle and amiable. They seem to live like children, happy and affectionate. They had decided to come to Switzerland suddenly, one evening. Mr. Smith brought home the tickets and they set off the same night. Alice's child is ten weeks old; he is called O. F. Alice is just as she always was; she is quite different from our other friends. She went on to Zurich, Lucerne, Bâle, and Paris, from whence she is going home this morning. On Friday morning she is to go to a dog show in London with one of her three dogs. I have her photograph in which she has on one side her baby, a beautiful child, and on the other a very fine dog. She seemed a little older than before. . . . The visit was over so quickly that I almost feel as if I had dreamt it.

After receiving Miss Niederhauser's reply to her letter about Mr. Smith's appearance, Miss Atkins wrote on January 13th, 1903 :

. . . Alice Birman Smith's husband corresponded with my dream in that he is very fair, with delicate features and a gentle demeanour and smaller than Alice; only in my dream he was only slightly smaller than Alice, whereas he would appear to be a good deal smaller, and Sophie

says he is clean-shaved, and I dreamt he had a fair moustache. Of course, if I were to see the man I could tell in an instant if he resembled my dream, and at all events, considering I had not the slightest idea of what he was like, my dream was fairly accurate, and besides that the incidents resembled very much the way that Sophie saw Alice; to wit, they were staying at a hotel, called on Sophie quite unexpectedly, both together, and were going to an exhibition to show a dog; the only difference in my dream was that I met them in the road; all the other particulars were correct. What strikes me as more wonderful, though, was the feeling when I read Sophie's letter that I already knew what she was telling me, a feeling perfectly clear and strong; that I think is the strongest proof of brain communication, far more important than the exact accuracy of the details.

In this case the letter must either have just arrived or have been on the verge of arriving when the dream corresponding to it occurred. We may further observe that if we may regard the dream Mr. Smith as sufficiently like the real one to justify the supposition that a supernormal impression of him had been received, it follows that the veridical parts of the dream were at any rate not entirely derived from the letter, but partly at least direct from the writer. This is an important consideration when we attempt to trace the supernormal process—assuming there was one; and the number of points in the dream corresponding with fact make chance coincidence improbable.

In the next case (L. 954, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 103) the time-coincidence between the dream and the arrival of the letter is very clear. On the other hand, the correspondence in the content of the two is practically limited to both being almost entirely occupied with the same unlikely individual. But again, as in the last case, we have an element in the dream—the interruption of the speaker by noise outside—which was not in the letter, but was in the mind of the writer.

(L. 954.)

The case comes from the Rev. W. M. Lewis, who wrote from Tyllwyd Penycwm, R. S. O., Pemb.

October 10th, 1891.

My residence, where I have lived for thirty years, is within half a dozen miles of St. David's Head, Pembrokeshire, occupying a farm and having the pastorate of a small country Welsh Nonconformist church. I spent, however, the greater part of May, 1890, in London, W. One morning during my stay there, I was awoken by the postman's knock, who, as usual, threw his letters [on] to the door mat within and passed on. Not wishing to get up just then, I again slept for a short time, all of which time became apparently occupied with a dream, in which I found myself in a crowded hall listening to a lecture by the Rev. D. C. D——, M.A. (London), then Principal of T—— College, Breconshire. The lecturer's voice, always weak, was quite inaudible from where I was seated; I strained to catch some remarks, but in vain. Some noises also outside the hall helped to drown his voice, and among the noises were the sounds of a band of music, which grew so loud eventually that the lecturer sat down. I got up from where I was seated and went and sat beside him, and told him I was anxious to attend his lectures at T—— College, and wished to know what were his present subjects. He attempted to tell me, but the noises outside were still so loud, that I was unable to understand what he said. After repeated attempts on his part, I was able to catch the words "Heaven" and "Hell." He, however, used a word in connection with each, which I was still unable to detect owing to the uproar still continuing. At last I discovered that this word was "crises," and that the subjects he wished to inform me of were "Crises in Heaven," "Crises in Hell." All the circumstances of this dream were so vivid and strange that when I awoke, and while I was dressing, it entirely occupied my thoughts, and I was endeavouring to imagine what could have suggested such a dream. On going downstairs I found that the only

letter delivered that morning was for me, and was from my youngest son, then at Aberystwyth College, on opening which, to my great astonishment, I found it wholly occupied with the name that had filled my dream and was then filling my thoughts, relating, after just a remark that he was glad I was enjoying my stay in London, that on the previous Sunday the Aberystwyth people and himself had had a great treat in having the Rev. D. C. D—— to occupy the pulpit of the chapel he was attending, and how he, being such a stranger to the place, had attracted immense congregations, preached powerful sermons, and made the Sunday quite an event in the place. I did not know that the Rev. Principal had any intention of visiting Aberystwyth, nor had I any means of knowing. The coincidence appeared to me very remarkable, that from the moment that the letter wholly occupied with the name of the Rev. D. C. D—— was thrown on the mat, and during the whole of the time that it lay there unopened, he should also have filled my dream, and should connect, through letter and dream combined, places so far distant and unconnected as London, Brecon, and Aberystwyth.

The strangest and most remarkable coincidence remains to be told. I mentioned above that in my dream Mr. D——'s voice in the lecture which I was endeavouring to hear, was inaudible owing to noises and music outside the hall. Now, I returned from London here the end of May, and in course of a couple of months—at the beginning of August—my son came home from Aberystwyth for midsummer holidays. One day at table, I related this dream in his hearing, and mentioned the strange coincidence between it and the letter. When I had finished my son said, "Father, it is very strange that on the Sunday night when Mr. D—— was preaching at the Tabernacle, Aberystwyth, soon after the service began, there was a circus passing into town, along the back road on which abuts the chapel wall, and so great was the noise and uproar of carriages, horses and crowd that for a long time Mr. D—— could not be heard; and much blame was thrown on the town authorities that they

allowed a procession of that character to disturb the Sunday services." It is but fair I should add that, though I have been once or twice at this chapel of Tabernacle at Aberystwyth, the lecture hall of my dream did not correspond to it, but the disturbing uproar of my London dream corresponded to that which appears to have occurred at the chapel in that it proceeded from behind the lecturer or preacher and not from behind the audience.

Mr. Lewis writes later :

I have shown the account to my son, who is now here —who corroborates all that relates to him.

Another case which appeared at the same time as Mr. Lewis's in the *Journal* has been published in *Proceedings*, Vol. XIV., p. 279. It was a dream of Sir Lawrence Jones's concerning a cheque having to be filled up and signed, which occurred while an unexpected letter containing a cheque the dreamer had to sign lay outside his bedroom door.

In the next case (L. 936, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 246), if the sequence of events is correctly remembered (there was an interval of over two years between dream and record), the arrival of a newspaper seems to have been the occasion of the dream. We first received a second-hand account from a lady cognisant of the circumstances at the time, from which it appears that the dream occurred in the winter of 1888-9. The dreamer, Mrs. E. F., wrote the following account on March 18, 1891 :

(L. 936.)

The son of an old friend came West for his health, and, apparently much helped, returned home some time before my own son's health began to fail. Building our hopes on doctor's advice, and what we thought Colorado climate had done for that young man, we came out here. About six weeks after, I dreamed one night that young G. had suddenly had a severe hemorrhage, ran right down and died in three or four days [in Connecticut].

So vivid was the dream that the grief of parents and only sister was deeply impressed on my mind for a long time, even to peculiar expressions they used in speaking of his death. I wondered about it in the morning as I had not corresponded with the family or heard about them from others since leaving home, but I was greatly startled, on getting my daily home papers [from Connecticut] in that morning's mail, to find a notice of the young man's death under circumstances very similar to those of my dream. The mother's rebellion at her son's death was afterwards voiced to me in a letter, in language very like that I dreamed of her using.

There are two other cases which might be called "Newspaper" cases, both sent by Mr. Andrew Lang, but I think if the newspaper had anything to do with the matter at all, it was probably as the source of the unknown agent's information. I will describe them briefly. The first (G. 268, *Journal*, Vol. X., p. 232) was a vivid dream of the death of G. Lohmann, the cricketer, two days after he died in South Africa, but shortly before seven o'clock on the morning of the day on which the news appeared in the morning papers. There was no normal association of ideas to suggest the dream, but the dreamer, Mr. Brierley, was on the reporting staff of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* and mainly concerned with cricket and football. The news of the death only reached the office after he had left it the previous evening, but it seems likely that some of his colleagues when they heard of it would think of him in connection with it, and a telepathic communication might be the result.

The other case (L. 1174, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 72) was a vivid dream of being in an earthquake which occurred in the early morning of December 29, 1908, about twenty-four hours after the great Messina earthquake. The dreamer's first normal knowledge of the earthquake she derived from the *Scotsman* newspaper of the morning of her dream, December 29. It had, however, been mentioned in the evening papers of December 28, and friends at a distance may have seen these and transmitted the

idea to the dreamer telepathically. This, however, is highly conjectural, for no particular agent can be suggested nor any reason why the dreamer should be selected as percipient. The case may be classed with veridical dreams of public events with which the dreamer is unconcerned, like that of President Carnot's murder (see above among death coincidences, M.Cl. 88, p. 241).

To go back to letters—the following is an odd case (L. 1137, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 227) in which the contents of a post-card seem to have been telepathically communicated to a person other than the one to whom it was addressed—involving apparently, if telepathic, a kind of three-cornered telepathy like L. 1180, p. 237 above. The case was sent to us by an Associate of the Society, Mr. Wilfred Hall, in a letter dated January 4, 1904. He had received the accounts from a friend of his who was acquainted with the ladies concerned. All give their names and addresses. The dreamer, Miss M. Robson, writes :

(L. 1137.)

On Monday, September 28th, [1903] Miss Elliott casually said to me that she intended going to Sunderland on the following Saturday, to see a friend.

That night I had a vivid dream : Miss Elliott came to me to show a letter which she had received from her Sunderland friend, asking her to postpone her visit, as bad news—some family trouble—necessitated her immediate departure.

I was much surprised when on the next day I told this dream to hear that a letter in actually the same words had been that morning received by Miss Elliott.

I may add I do not profess to attach any importance to dreams, and it is quite an unusual thing for me to relate one.

M. ROBSON.

E. M. ELLIOTT.

Miss Elliott's own account is as follows :

GATESHEAD, *November 25th*, 1903.

Some time ago I mentioned to Miss Robson that I had to go to Sunderland on a certain day to see a friend.

On the morning of the day on which I had arranged to go, I received a post-card asking me to postpone my visit, as my friend had had some very bad news about a sister living at some distance. This news was totally unexpected, and was a great shock to me, as I know all the family well.

When I saw Miss Robson an hour or so afterwards, almost her first words to me were: "Oh, I had such a strange and vivid dream last night," and then she proceeded to tell me her dream, which was in all respects what had really happened, even to the wording of the post-card.

I may say Miss Robson knows my friend Miss Smith, but has never met her sister.

E. M. ELLIOTT.

Another dream in which the percipient dreamt the substance of a postal communication is L. 895, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 173. The dreamer was Professor Thomas Davidson, the philosopher, a friend of William James. He writes:

(L. 895.)

KEENE, ESSEX CO., N.Y., [Tuesday] *June 9th*, 1891.

DEAR MR. HODGSON,—Last night, toward morning, I dreamt in a vivid way that my friend, Mr. S. F. Weston, whom you know, had sent me a *postal card* saying that he was "coming on Wednesday." I mentioned my dream to two friends, Miss Kent and Mrs. John Dewey (of Ann Arbor), at the breakfast-table. At ten we started for Upper Jay, some nine miles off. On our way home we called at the post-office, and there I received from Mr. Weston the enclosed *letter*, the unscored part of which you are free to publish. This was about four o'clock in the afternoon.

You will see from the letter that I had no reason to suppose Mr. Weston was coming before the end of the month. Note that the words which I saw on the card are *not* in the letter. The "Wednesday" made a very

distinct impression on my mind. The letter, as you will see, was written on Sunday.

I enclose the independent testimonies of the two ladies.

* * * * *

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

P.S.—You will understand that, leaving New York to-day, Mr. W. will get here to-morrow (Wednesday).
—T. D.

In his letter Mr. Weston says :

36, LEE AVE., BROOKLYN, *June 7th*, 1891.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIDSON,—I have delayed answering your letter for several days as I have not been quite sure where I should spend the month of June. . . . Am sorry I shall not be able to get the things you wanted as I shall take the boat Tuesday night. Wish you had mentioned them in your letter. . . .

S. F. WESTON.

I omit the corroboration by the two ladies, which is printed in the *Journal*.

There is, it will be observed, no exact time-coincidence here. The dream occurred more than twenty-four hours after the letter was written, and apparently some time before it arrived, while the journey of which the letter spoke commenced some twelve hours after the dream. In the case to be next quoted (L. 1218) there is the same absence of time-coincidence combined with communication corresponding with a letter or parts of it. The letter was dated and therefore presumably at least begun more than two days before the dream, but was not posted till some twenty-four hours after it. In both these cases it seems certain that, so far as there was supernormal communication, it was the agent's intention to convey the information that operated and not the letter itself. This makes it probable that the exact time-coincidence between the dream and the arrival of the letter in other cases was accidental except so far as the emergence of the impression just then may have been stimulated either by the

writer's knowledge of when the letter was likely to arrive or the dreamer's consciousness of the postman's knock.¹

The case in question (L. 1218, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 225) was sent to us by an Associate of the Society, Mrs. C., on March 11, 1918, the dreamer being her daughter. For shortness I omit Mrs. C.'s narrative and other corroborative evidence including a note made before the letter was received (all of which are printed in the *Journal*), and give only the dreamer's account, which we received on April 6, 1918. She writes :

(L. 1218.)

On the morning of Jan. 13th, I awoke from a vivid dream in which I saw Arthur S. standing in front of me, in khaki. He looked pleased and said he had some important news to tell me—giving no details, but I heard him say, "I can never forget my old friend [G]."—Then I awoke.

At breakfast I mentioned my dream without going into details, in fact I wanted the others to guess of whom I had dreamt as it was a very out of the way person. Mother asked me not to give any details until the same evening, which I did in the presence of my sister.

Three days later, by the very last post, I received a letter from Arthur S., dated the 10th, though bearing the postmark of the 14th from Seaford. We were all very surprised to hear that he was in England, that he had joined up and had just got married. Almost the last sentence in his letter contained these words *re* my brother, "I often think of my old friend [G.] . . . I have met a lot of people, but I never forget [G]."

[Signed with full name.]

It should be explained that the dreamer's brother [G.] had been killed in the war about two years before, and that

¹ That it is the ideas of the writer of the letter in "letter arrival" cases, and not the letter itself or the actual time of its arrival that influences the percipient is supported by a case (M. 41) quoted by Myers in *Proceedings*, Vol. IX., pp. 68-70. In this case the information emerged through automatic writing.

Arthur S. was a friend of his whom the dreamer and her family believed to be permanently in Canada. Nothing had occurred to make the dreamer think of him.

§ 4. *Coincidence with ideas not connected by agent with percipient. Unconscious telepathic leakage.*

I now pass on to cases where the contents of the dream or hallucination appear to be due, as in the last section, to an idea or thought in the agent's mind, but one entirely unconnected by him with the percipient. And not only had the agent no intention of communicating the idea to the percipient, but, so far as is known, no thought at all of the percipient in connection with it. If there was telepathic communication, the agent's share in it might be described as unconscious telepathic leakage.

I will give first a dream (L. 1219, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 227) dreamt by the same lady who sent us the one last quoted. To put it shortly: on January 16th, 1918, Mrs. C., the mother of the dreamer, spent the afternoon with Madme. R., who lived at the top of a high block of flats. In the course of conversation on many topics, Madme. R. related how Mrs. X. in a delicate state of health greatly dreaded air-raids. One took place. Mrs. X. was taken ill and twins were born prematurely. Mrs. C., who did not know Mrs. X., is certain that she did not repeat this tale to her family. Next morning, however, her daughter related a dream which she, the dreamer, afterwards wrote down as follows:

(L. 1219.)

On Wednesday, the 16th Jan., I dreamt as follows:

There was a dreadful air-raid in progress. Mother and I were in a lofty building watching it and at the same time attending to a very tiny baby, which I was holding in my arms, wrapped in a blanket.

There was also another woman in the room carrying a tiny baby, and she seemed very agitated as she walked up and down with it.

In my dream the raid was very bad, and I could see

flashes of light on the windows and was nearly deafened with the noise of guns and the humming of the aeroplanes. I remember feeling terrified at the time, as it was quite the worst raid I had ever been in. I told mother this the next morning, when she at once said, "Oh, but this is what Mme. R. told me when I was with her yesterday."

[Signed with full name.]

For shortness I omit the agent's account and corroborative evidence. A bad air raid combined with two little babies seems too [] complicated a coincidence to attribute to chance.

In the next case (L. 836, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 221) the idea transferred is simple but very definite, and the dream evidently made an unusual impression. It comes from a gentleman who does not wish his name to be printed. His wife has sent us a similar, though somewhat less full account of what occurred.

•
(L. 836.)

December 9th, 1889.

On Sunday morning, November 24th [1889], I was at home, reading carefully Sir William Hamilton's *Lectures on Metaphysics*. After finishing Lecture xx., I felt somewhat drowsy, and very soon fell asleep. This was at about 12 o'clock. I slept for about 10 minutes, and during that time I dreamt that a friend of mine appeared before me and said, "I say, you owe me twopence for postage in connection with that mortgage." "All right," I replied, "business is business," and saying this I put my hand in my pocket, and drawing it out gave him the twopence he required. With this I woke.

My friend has been managing some mortgage business for me during the last two months.

My wife had gone out about 10.15 a.m., intending to visit a church she had not been to before. Finding it rather farther than she expected, she thought she would like to take the tram back. But she had left her purse at home. However, being near a friend's house (the

friend I saw in my dream), she called in and asked for the loan of twopence. His wife lent my wife sixpence, and he himself accompanied my wife to the church, which was very near. It was just before 11 o'clock. After the service my wife took the tram, and arrived home at about 1 o'clock. My dream had made so great an impression on my mind that I immediately told her about it, and to my utter astonishment she related the story of borrowing twopence, which she said she would not have thought it worth while mentioning otherwise.

A dream case printed in the *Journal* for January 1920 (L. 1228, *Journal*, Vol. XIX., p. 138) resembles the last in triviality and contemporaneousness, and eminently suggests unconscious telepathic leakage, or, as the agent calls it, "telepathy without conscious effort." It was sent to us by Mr. B. Jordan-Smith, an Associate of the Society, who wrote :

(L. 1228.)

ORCHARDLEA, GROSVENOR ROAD, CAVERSHAM, READING,
November 27, 1919.

Miss E. M. Thomas [the percipient] is a Birmingham friend of ours and staying at the above address for a few days. So far I have never tried any telepathic experiments with the lady.

After relating what she said was her dream, she modified it by saying that she was more or less in the stage of waking (half awake).

Mrs. Jordan-Smith confirms these statements as she was present at the time.

B. JORDAN-SMITH.

The following statements were enclosed with this letter :

I.

November 26th, 1919 (written 10 a.m.)

At 8.30 a.m. this morning at breakfast at the above address, Miss Ethel Thomas, a visitor, related what she

said at the time was a dream, just on the point of waking up, as follows :

“I was counting the number of men and women going on board ship at Southampton, and the number was fifteen. I could almost tell who they were.”

I mentioned that I thought that this was a case of “telepathy without conscious effort,” and related that at 8.15 a.m. I was shaving in an adjoining room, and counting up in my mind the number of people going on board ship on Thursday, and on a ship at Southampton, the same time. The total number was 15.

Mrs. Jordan-Smith just after I had shaved went into Miss Thomas’s room to rouse her. B. JORDAN-SMITH.

II.

November 26, 1919.

[I was] just dreaming when Mrs. B. Jordan-Smith called me this morning, or rather she came into my room and touched me and said: “Breakfast will soon be ready, but no hurry.”

I got up, without hurry, and came down and found Mr. and Mrs. Jordan-Smith having breakfast. I said to Mrs. Jordan-Smith: “I was dreaming about a ship when you came and woke me.” Mr. Jordan-Smith then took it up: “What about a ship?” he asked. “Oh,” I replied, “it was just going from *Southampton*, and I stood by counting the people going aboard.” “How many?” he asked.

“Fifteen,” I replied.

He then told me that just before, and at the time Mrs. Jordan-Smith broke into my dream, he was shaving in bath-room, and was thinking over a ship sailing from *Southampton* next day, on which he had *fifteen passengers*.

ETHEL MARLER THOMAS.

(witness) ANNIE JORDAN-SMITH.

In answer to enquiries, Mr. and Mrs. Jordan-Smith and Miss Thomas make it clear that none of them remembered anything having been said, or having happened,

that could have suggested to Miss Thomas ships sailing from Southampton or the number of passengers.

Another case in which unconscious leakage seems to have occurred is L. 1191 (*Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 337), the agent being either Mrs. or Miss Verrall—probably the former—and the percipient Miss “Ann Jones” (pseudonym) mentioned below (pp. 330 and 352) who was staying with them. As regards the agent’s side Mrs. Verrall writes :

(L. 1191.)

On October 22, 1912, my daughter’s script contained the phrases, in juxtaposition :

“The Lombard poplar—the Florentine’s fierce love—”

This script was seen by me on Nov. 2, and suggested to me that the combination of Lombardy with Dante might refer to Dante’s stay at Verona. *Dante at Verona* is the title and subject of a poem by D. G. Rossetti.

On November 7 I began annotating this H. V. script, but left my notes incomplete for further investigation of its literary or classical allusions.

Further investigation, after the hint given by the dream, makes it clear that the allusion in the script is to *Dante at Verona*. . . .

Miss Jones knew that my daughter and I were automatic writers, but had no knowledge of the H. V. script of Oct. 22, 1912.

M. DE G. VERRALL.

At breakfast on November 10th Miss Jones described spontaneously to Miss Verrall, and afterwards to Mrs. Verrall, her dream of the night before, and their accounts are given in the *Journal*, but omitted here for shortness.

Miss Jones’s own account is as follows :

Nov. 21, 1912.

On the night between Saturday and Sunday, November 9 and 10 (1912), I was awakened from a rather confused dream, in which I was either writing script myself or watching people write, by a voice which gave me a very urgent message to the effect that “They” were to be

told to look at Verona, or to go to Verona, as "They" were now on the wrong tack. I was sufficiently awake to know where I was, and I asked, "Whom shall I tell—Helen?" "Tell H. to tell her mother," was the reply. It seemed to me that the mask of Dante, which I may have seen that afternoon in Newnham Library, was floating in the darkness. There was more of this message, and I was urged to write it down there and then, but, feeling disinclined to get up for a light and writing materials, I satisfied myself by repeating the whole message. In the morning, however, I had forgotten all but what I told Miss Verrall, and have here set down. I am not quite sure that I was myself writing script in the dream.

[Signed ANN JONES.]

Miss Verrall adds :

Miss Jones told me to-day, Nov. 21, 1912, that what she saw in her dream was the death mask of Dante, with which she is familiar, not the bust of which there is a copy in the Newnham Library; but she thought the one might have reminded her of the other.

HELEN DE G. VERRALL.

P.S.—(Dec. 2, 1912.) Although I have often discussed questions of psychical research with Miss Jones, I am absolutely certain that I never told her anything of the contents of my unpublished scripts (except that I once quoted to her an automatic poem which I wrote some years ago) until after she had told me of her dream on Nov. 10, 1912. I then said that I had recently had a script containing references to Dante and Verona.

H. DE G. V.

There is a curious case (L. 1182, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 382) of a dream during a few minutes' afternoon sleep reproducing a scene foretold in planchette writing, of which the dreamer knew nothing; but as the dream was not mentioned till the planchette prophecy had been described to the dreamer, and as the dreamer seems both uninterested in the incident and distrustful of his own

memory after a few weeks, I will not describe it further here. There was certainly no intentional telepathic transference.

In two other instances of unconscious leakage (if there was telepathy), both collected for us by Mr. F. J. M. Stratton of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and carefully gone into in detail by him, the dreams occurred apparently two or three days after the incidents, to which they respectively seem to refer, had become known to the supposed agents. There was therefore no traceable time-coincidence between the impressions of agent and percipient, and though this does not exclude telepathy as the source of the ideas in the percipient's mind, it leaves a wider scope for chance. In both cases the agent and percipient were in correspondence, though in the first only about a visit the percipient was to pay to the agent. I will describe both cases briefly.

(L. 1184.)

In the first (L. 1184, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 87) Mrs. Woollacott had been staying with a sister-in-law who had two sons aged eleven and seventeen. A few days after she left, namely, on August 23, 1910, the younger nephew had an accident in the swimming bath, alarming at the moment but leading to no serious consequences. Of this Mrs. Woollacott heard from her sister-in-law on August 30th or 31st. During the first week in September her friend Miss Poupard had a dream which impressed her much at the time, and which she describes on November 11th, 1910, as follows:

In my dream I was reading a newspaper, when the stop-press news attracted my attention; I read that an accident had happened to one of Mrs. Woollacott's nephews. As I read I seemed to see the occurrence—the boy appeared to fall from a bridge or other structure into some water, being either killed in the fall, or drowned. The strange part of it was that I had no idea my friend Mrs. Woollacott had any nephews, yet in my dream there were distinctly two, their ages being about twelve and seventeen.

Miss Poupard related this dream to Mrs. Woollacott when she went to stay with her on September 11th—before she could by any possibility have heard about the nephews or the accident.

In the other case (L. 1185, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 107) the dreamer, Dr. R. G. Markham, describes what occurred as follows on April 30th, 1911 :

(L. 1185.)

April 30th, 1911.

During the night of Dec. 5th, 1909, I had a dream which was so peculiar as to impress itself on my memory, and the next morning I mentioned it to the people with whom I was staying at the time, and also the same day wrote to my *fiancée*, and told her to remind me, on the following day, to narrate it to her, but gave her no particulars.

As far as I can now remember, the dream was as follows :

A physician, Dr. L., and I were standing at a bedside. I recognised the patient to be a certain Nurse W. who was at that [time] a nurse at the Prince of Wales's General Hospital, Tottenham. The Doctor, after examining her chest, asked me to do so as well, and then asked my opinion about the disease present, stating that he himself thought that she was suffering from heart disease, but certain other signs suggested more serious mischief.

During my residence at this hospital, this particular nurse had always been considered as one of the strongest, and it was this fact that impressed the dream on my memory. The next day, Dec. 7th, I met my *fiancée* and narrated the dream to her, and to my astonishment found that the nurse about whom I had dreamt had actually been examined and advised to leave the hospital.

R. G. MARKHAM.

Miss Wilson, afterwards Mrs. Markham, gave a substantially similar account almost a year earlier. This is printed in the *Journal*. It appears that Nurse W. had

been examined by Dr. L. on December 3rd, 1909, and that she finally left the hospital about December 12th, 1909. Presumably Miss Wilson was the agent in this case.

As more or less analogous to these latter dreams may be mentioned L. 1096 and L. 1098 (*Journal*, Vol. VIII., pp. 141 and 145), which came to us from the former American Branch of the Society. The dreamer, Miss Luke, was in the habit of having veridical dreams and also impressions about people somewhat as Mrs. Adam did (see above, L. 1164, p. 64). In the *Journal*, Vol. VIII., four of Miss Luke's dreams are recorded, three of them collected and arranged, with, in two cases, corroborative evidence, by Dr. Osgood Mason, who knew her well. Of the four dreams, however, the most striking was recorded too long after the event for our collection, and the most important evidentially is quoted in Myers' *Human Personality*. In the two that remain, the coincidences are perhaps hardly remarkable enough to merit discussion here, though interesting regarded as items in a series.

In the dreams apparently showing telepathic leakage so far considered in the present section there is no reason, except possibly in L. 1185 (p. 320), to suspect the presence of emotional disturbance in the agent's mind. In the next four cases the idea transferred was to the agent a cause of mental agitation or emotion. Whether this helped to give it what we may call telepathic energy, we do not know, but at any rate that energy was not intentionally directed to the percipient. I will take the cases in the order in which they appeared in the *Journal*. The first (L. 1168, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 153) came through the American Branch of the Society. It was sent to Dr. Hodgson by an acquaintance—a Member of the Society—whose name as well as those of agent and percipient are suppressed for reasons that will be obvious. He says of Mr. A., the husband of the agent, that he is a gentleman of unquestioned character and standing whom he has known well for twenty years. Mr. A. writes :

(L. 1168.)

NEW YORK, *March 24, 1893.*

On the 9th of March, 1893, I received from Mr. B. a letter dated March 8th, 1893, asking for a loan of a considerable sum of money. The circumstances in the case called for very careful consideration, and certain peculiar personal relations to Mr. B. and his family connections made it important to have the advice and opinion of my wife. I therefore showed Mr. B.'s letter to her, and asked her to think about it for a day or two, which she did, and talked with me on the subject on the evening of March 9th, and also from time to time on the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of March.

On the 14th of March she received from a friend—Mrs. C.—living in a Western town about 2000 miles from New York, a letter dated and posted March 11th, 1893, as follows :

“My dear Mrs. A.,—Although still confined to my bed as I wrote you, and finding it a physical difficulty to write, a dream of you, which has come to me two successive nights, is so real I must transcribe it to you, however lightly you may choose to consider it, and I beg your generous heart to pardon any presumption which may appear in my making sufficient of it to send you a description.

“I saw you walking meditatively up and down a path in your home, with a lace scarf about your head, considering a loan of which you were contemplating the making. You were quite inclined to the transaction, but a voice kept saying to me, ‘She will regret it—tell her not to. It will lead to grief for her, and for many reasons be a mistake.’

“My dear friend of the olden and the present time, laugh if you will, but accept the interest and affection which prompt my writing, and with love to your household, believe me ever your faithful friend, “ [Mrs.] C.”

Mrs. C. has not been East within the past six months.

I have the best reason to believe that she has never seen Mr. B. nor any of his family relatives or connections. My wife is quite positive that she never mentioned him

nor any of his connections to Mrs. C., and that Mrs. C. does not know of his existence.

Dr. Hodgson's informant tells him that he himself carefully compared the copy of Mrs. C.'s letter, incorporated in Mr. A.'s statement,] with the original. He adds :

"You will note that in Mrs. C.'s dream Mrs. A. was 'quite inclined towards the transaction.' Mr. A. says this is correct. It is probably also correct that Mrs. A. wore a lace scarf about her head, though of this she cannot be certain. Mrs. C. had seen Mrs. A. wearing such a scarf a year or so ago."

The repetition of the dream, as here described, is an interesting and unusual feature.

In the next case (L. 1173, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 328) the dreamer was Miss Lucy Edmunds, for a long time secretary to Dr. Hodgson, and until recently an Honorary Associate of the Society. It is an interesting case, but as affording evidence of telepathy somewhat dubious because the dream might quite well have occurred without stimulus from without. It is, in fact, what Gurney would have called an ambiguous case—a class of cases dealt with below. The likelihood, however, is considerable that the dream was influenced by Mr. Brown's desire to see a vision of his dead son and his effort to do so at apparently the very time of the dream; especially as his mind and Miss Edmunds' were both occupied with the same scene—the view from the window. It has been suggested above (pp. 182-3) that common interest in a locality may have facilitated telepathic impressions in certain cases.

Miss Edmunds writes on June 5, 1896 :

(L. 1173.)

On Wednesday, June 3rd, Dorothy showed me a miniature of her brother Stuart, who died last February 5th, and whom I have never seen.

On Thursday, June 4, I went upstairs at nine and

undressed in the dark so as to enjoy the lights in the distance through the open windows. I loitered, and several times sat on the sofa by the window looking towards the Town Hall. It was 9.30 before I was in bed, when I fell asleep almost immediately. I awoke from a dream soon after ten. (I judged the time, not from my watch, but from hearing the clock strike eleven (what seemed to be) nearly an hour after awaking.)

I dreamed that I was awake and sitting on the sofa looking down the hill towards the lights among the trees, just as I had sat before going to bed, when suddenly one of the lights took the form of a human face among the trees. I was so surprised that I rose up and went nearer to the window and exclaimed aloud:

"What an astonishing thing, that looks exactly like the face of Stuart Brown!"

The face immediately smiled; the eyes lit up and looked right into mine, and the face came swiftly towards me through the trees, when, just as it got near the window, it vanished, and I awoke and heard footsteps in a closet which is next to the room I occupied.

The dream was so vivid that I could, on awaking, mentally recall the face and compare it with the miniature which I had seen the day before. It was *like* the miniature, but *life size* and radiant with light and expression, coming out of the light at which I had been looking.

The dream wakened me so thoroughly that I did not sleep again until after twelve.

I related the dream to Mrs. Brown at breakfast time after Mr. Brown had gone, and asked her if she went to the closet and whether she thought of Stuart at the time. I thought in the night that such might be the case.

Before mentioning the dream to Mr. Brown in the evening, Mrs. Brown asked him what he was thinking of when he went to the closet the night before. He could not remember thinking of anything special excepting in connection with some boots which he placed on a shelf, and which he had not worn since in camp last summer; but he interrupted me, or tried to, when I began to tell

him my dream and spoke of sitting at the window and looking at the lights. After I had finished telling my dream he related the following, which he wrote immediately after.

Mr. Brown's account is as follows :

On the evening of June 4, 1896, about 10.10 p.m., I was sitting in the parlor facing the bay-window looking south-west, ["where," he says later, "the outlook is almost precisely the same" as from Miss Edmunds' window] reading the paper. My mind wandered from the reading to thoughts of Myers' articles on Crystal-Visions, which I had read a day or two before.

Looking out of the window I thought of Stuart, wondering if it were possible for his face to appear to me and with a great longing that I might see him. I wondered if I could be susceptible to such visions, but as I had never experienced anything of the kind, in a few moments gave it up.

After attending to one or two household duties, I went upstairs at 10.20 as I noticed by the clock. On reaching my room the first thing done was to put away a new pair of shoes, moving at the time an old pair which I had not worn since I was in camp with Stuart last August.

This accounts for the footsteps Miss Edmunds heard in the closet when she awoke, and times the dream as having occurred within a very few minutes of Mr. Brown's longing to see the vision.

There follows evidence to show that Mr. Brown's recollection of his experience and Miss Edmunds' of hers were independent.

The following carefully recorded case (L. 1183, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 17) speaks for itself.

The account was sent to us by Major Nelson :

(L. 1183.)

THE MANOR HOUSE, STOKE D'ABERNON,
SURREY, *August 29th*, 1910.

Playing golf last week I happened to mention to my opponent, a member of the Psychical Research Society

a strange incident that occurred to me last Xmas Eve, or rather in the early hours of Xmas Day.

I ought to tell you that I never dream. I believe as a child I had nightmares like other children, but since then a dream has been to me an unknown quantity.

With this knowledge you will understand why what occurred last Xmas made so deep an impression. The whole of that day and the next my mind was obsessed by the incident, but I kept it entirely to myself.

On the morning of the 27th I dreamed again, and at dinner the same night the conversation turned upon dreams. Then for the first time I communicated my strange experiences to two ladies sitting on either side of me, Mrs. Rowan Hamilton, of Killyleagh Castle, Co. Down, and her niece by marriage, Mrs. Sidney Rowan Hamilton.

On the 28th I wrote to Mr. Sandwith, the Rector of St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, whom I had not seen for some considerable time, and asked him if he had been worried about some child. He replied by coming down to Stoke, and was amazed when I told him what had occurred, and proceeded to tell me what had been going on in his parish.

There is no possible explanation of how I could have been cognisant of the fact that Mr. Sandwith had been worried, for I had never heard of the child or of the German.

His letter was written after his visit in reply to my question, and at my request he wrote setting forth the particulars. I enclose the original documents.

A. NELSON, *Major*.

P.S.—I am, or rather was, by no means well acquainted with the passage from Scripture; yet it is verbatim correct.

Major Nelson sent us with this letter the original records he had made of his two dreams at the time, which were as follows :

THE MANOR HOUSE, STOKE D'ABERNON,
SURREY, *Xmas Day, '09.*

Last night I dreamed a dream so strange and vivid that I wish to record the occurrence while I can remember the details.

I dreamed that I was in the drawing-room of 12A, Charterhouse Square, alone. Suddenly the door opened and Sandwith came in and said: "Look here, Nelson, you can help me—I wish you would come—I am terribly distressed about this poor child, a soldier's child too." I got up and followed him to the dining-room. He knelt down at the table and motioned me to kneel beside him. Then he said, "Now, I want you to repeat every word I say after me." I cannot remember the exact words, but the gist was that God would intervene to save some child—whether from danger or death I know not—for I cannot recall the words.

Suddenly Sandwith stopped speaking English, and began to pray in German. I was unable then to repeat his words, for I know no German, and as I was telling him so, I awoke.

A. NELSON.

Dec. 27th, '09.

I have had another dream of startling significance, and record it at once.

I dreamed that I asked myself what could possibly be the meaning of so extraordinary a request on Sandwith's part. Immediately there came into my mind or fell upon my ear—I know not which—these words: "If two of you shall agree upon earth as touching anything they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven."

Mr. Sandwith, after visiting Major Nelson and hearing of his dream, sent him the following statement of the circumstances, which he forwarded to us:

12A, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.,

Dec. 30, '09.

Here are the particulars. I have for a fortnight or so before Christmas been considerably worried over the marriage of a German, not a naturalized Englishman, to a girl in this Parish.

I spoke to the girl's father about it, and wrote to the Bishop of London asking whether the production of a

licence would guarantee the validity of the marriage, if the contracting parties eventually resided in Germany.

The Bishop said he thought so, but that I had better go to Doctors' Commons and state the facts, in case they had overlooked the point of the man not being a naturalized Englishman.

I asked the father of the girl to accompany me, but he said he felt satisfied. This added considerably to my worry, as I felt he was the proper person to safeguard his daughter's future, and any interference on my part was a delicate matter. As the Bishop's letter was addressed to me personally through his Chaplain, "you had better go to Doctors' Commons," I regarded it as a personal direction from my Bishop and went, and asked for a written statement from the Chancellor of the Diocese that all was in order. This I duly received, and the marriage was solemnized on Christmas Day at 10.20 a.m.

W. F. G. SANDWITH.

We have also received from Mrs. Rowan Hamilton, of Killyleagh Castle, County Down, the following statement:

Nov. 9, 1910.

With reference to your letter dated 29th Oct., 1910, to Major A. Nelson regarding the dream described by him, I wish to corroborate his statement to you dated 29th August, 1910.

LINA ROWAN HAMILTON.

A similar statement has been received from Mrs. Sidney Rowan Hamilton, to whom Major Nelson also spoke of his dream.

In reply to questions tending to elicit what normal causes might have produced the dream, Major Nelson states that he had never helped Mr. Sandwith in any way in his parochial work. He also says that Mr. Sandwith assured him that he had not thought of him in connection with his difficulty. He adds:

Nov. 4, '10.

The only connection that I can conceive between the fact of Mr. Sandwith's being worried and my dream is

the existence of some lines on the subject of prayer written in a friend's Prayer Book, which I sent to Mr. Sandwith, before writing them in the book, to ask whether the theology was sound, in September, 1909.

This statement of Major Nelson's is of psychological interest as possibly throwing light on the mechanism of the dream. It seems as if the telepathic impulse had been the primary cause of the dream; that the thought of the German and Mr. Sandwith thus telepathically aroused had called up, through a normal process of association of ideas with the latter, the additional notion of prayer, and that the three conceptions were combined into the dream idea of Mr. Sandwith reciting a prayer in German.

The remaining case (L. 1197, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 118) of this class—unconscious leakage with emotion on the part of the agent—is a curious one. It came to us from Dr. Emil Mattiesen of Berlin, who evidently took much trouble in collecting the evidence—all the more difficult to do because it comes largely from uneducated persons. It is long and somewhat complicated, so I will give only the main points here. The percipient, Mr. Joseph Zöhrer, was a shoemaker in Berlin. On May 5th, 1913, he gave an account of what he regarded as a waking vision, and of the events connected with it, orally to Dr. Mattiesen, who took it down from his dictation. He was, it appears, in the habit of occasionally seeing visions and hearing voices. In this vision, which occurred on March 16th, or possibly 15th, 1912, angelic beings and other "spirits" took part, and the angelic beings told him his sister, Mrs. Agnes Sommer, was in need, and that it was his duty to help her; while a voice said he was to send her 60 kronen. This he did by postal order, the post office receipt being dated March 19th, 1912. This is the only contemporary document, for the sister's post-card acknowledging the money is lost. According to her brother [translated by Dr. Mattiesen] it ran: "Dear brother. The money you sent me, was a great divine miracle. I was in great need and have prayed God

fervently for help. Then I was told help would come, whereupon I thanked God. But of you I had no thought."

Mrs. Sommer has written to Dr. Mattiesen to the same effect. She kept a shop at Graz in Styria, and her brother believed her to be in fairly flourishing circumstances. She was, however, in great difficulty for want of about 60 kronen to meet an urgent account. According to a letter to her brother dated July 19th, 1912, seen by Dr. Mattiesen, and confirmed by the one to himself on May 23rd, 1913, she had prayed earnestly for help on March 17th, 1912, and received assurance that her prayer would be answered. Also on March 18th, the eve of her brother's name day, she had prayed for "bliss for her brother." Both these dates were apparently after her brother's vision, but her anxiety and need of assistance probably began considerably earlier.

There is a case difficult to classify (P. 286, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 51) which should perhaps be placed in this section—unconscious leakage. On the other hand, however, the more important part of it may be interpreted as a premonition not involving telepathy. It is recorded very fully in the *Journal*, and I feel tempted to leave it at that lest I should be accused of dragging evidence for premonition unfairly into a discussion of telepathy. I will, however, compromise by mentioning the chief points. Miss "Ann Jones," another of whose experiences is described on p. 317 and others on p. 352, dreamt on the night of July 15th, 1912, that a lady with whom she had recently been staying and a party of friends came in very late from an after-dinner motor drive. This was veridical as far as it went, and happened on the night of the dream and probably almost exactly contemporaneously with it, though it is unlikely that Miss Jones' friends thought of her in connexion with their excursion. But mixed up with this in the dream was a Mr. M. who had nothing to do in fact with the motor party, but whose poems Miss Jones had been arranging for publication. In the dream he showed her a

portfolio of drawings illustrating the poems. Now Mr. M. had recently made the acquaintance of an artist, Mr. F., who was not known to Miss Jones. He first saw him on the day (July 11th) on which Miss Jones was arranging the poems, which she despatched to Mr. M. on the 12th. There was no conscious idea of their being illustrated at that time, nor till July 18th, when Mr. M. visited Mr. F. at his studio and a sketch for one poem was made, and when Mr. F. asked to see the whole collection. The illustrations were drawn in the following week and Miss Jones saw them on the 29th, when she found they resembled the portfolio of her dream. If this was premonition pure and simple, we have nothing to do with it here. But if the coincidence was brought about by telepathy, then we must suppose either that Miss Jones first had the idea, which emerged in her dream, of the poems being illustrated, and as agent telepathically suggested it to Mr. M. and through him to Mr. F., or that Mr. M. himself had subconsciously the idea of illustrations, owing perhaps to making Mr. F.'s acquaintance, and telepathically transferred it to Miss Jones. Mr. M. may have known the probable style and appearance that illustrations by Mr. F. would assume. I do not think some such chain of psychical events at all impossible, nor even strained, with the extended idea of the operation of telepathy which is, I think, gradually being forced on us. At the same time there is in this case by itself nothing that can be called evidence of it.

It will have struck the reader in perusing the cases so far recorded in this chapter that after § 1, which contains the death coincidences, a very large proportion of the experiences of percipients are dreams. This is especially so in § 3 and § 4, dealing with apparent transference of ideas. And this might have been expected, because, except in cases of very definite crisis in the agent's life, or of very definite desire to communicate with the percipient, some correspondence in detail is usually required before we begin to think the coincidence between the agent's and the percipient's experiences remarkable; and

details we are much more likely to get in dreams than in apparitions. As said before, apparitions of the realistic kind, which are the commonest, seldom convey anything more to the percipient than the idea of the agent's personality. If they suggest, *e.g.* his death, it is usually by inference only—the inference that so unusual an experience must portend something serious. An interesting exception, if it was telepathic, is the case (L. 1109) with which I begin the next section.

§ 5. *Ambiguous Cases.*

By ambiguous cases I mean (1) cases in which the percipient's experience is clear and interesting, but in which either the agent's corresponding experience is not distinctive or unusual enough for us to claim the coincidence between the two as evidence of telepathy, or the correspondence in time is doubtful. There is a coincidence of a kind, and telepathy may account for it, but the cases would hardly be worth quoting from that point of view alone. (2) Cases may also be called ambiguous when the coincidence is remarkable, but we cannot point to a particular agent. The fact conveyed to the percipient by his experience was true and was doubtless known to some person or persons, but there was no obvious reason why the percipient should have been in touch with them, so that if the knowledge was obtained telepathically, an extended view of the operation of telepathy seems to be involved.

There is, of course, no hard and fast line marking off ambiguous cases, and the line would probably be drawn differently by different people. Moreover, it will at once occur to the reader that ambiguous cases have already been quoted or mentioned in this paper. In particular I have not attempted to exclude them in Chapter II., dealing with non-externalised impressions, and there are several examples there. In the present chapter we have also had ambiguous cases, included generally because they seemed analogous to some other case. As examples may be mentioned the dreams of President Carnot's murder (M. Cl. 88, p. 241), of General H.'s death (L. 1180, p. 237),

and the dream of an earthquake (L. 1174, p. 308), because in these we cannot point to a particular agent; and, again, Miss Edmunds' dream (L. 1173, p. 323) and two "arrival" cases (L. 1222, p. 295, and L. 1225, p. 296), because it is doubtful whether the agent's side of the coincidence is sufficiently marked. What I am really doing now, therefore, is to put together in this section a residuum of cases, ambiguous in one of the two ways mentioned, which belong to this chapter because the percipient's experience is either a sensory hallucination or a dream of the same character, but which do not conveniently fit into any of the groups into which the cases in the chapter have been divided.

The first case (L. 1109, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 329) I place here with some hesitation. There is some evidence for telepathy, but it depends on details of the agent's costume at the moment being apprehended by the percipient, and it is difficult to know how distinctive that apprehension was, especially as the case did not reach us till the agent and percipient had talked the matter over. The case is interesting whatever way we look at it, for if the percipient was, as he believed, awake at the time, it is exceptional in our collection in two respects. It is the only realistic apparition affecting three senses—hearing, sight and touch—and it is the only realistic apparition conveying any information as to the agent's actual condition at the moment. The percipient, at the time a schoolboy at a boarding school, wrote in August 1898 :

(L. 1109.)

On Sunday night, March 20th, 1898, I had gone to bed as usual (about 9.30 or 10). I could not sleep and began thinking of home and especially of mother. My bed was so placed that I could see the staircase, and, after a bit, to my surprise, I heard someone coming up the stairs. It flashed into my mind that it was mother, and so it proved to be. She was dressed in a black dress that I had never seen before, and had on her pink shawl and gold chain, and as she came into the room her

shoes creaked ; in fact, they did so all the time. I did not feel at all frightened but tried to get out of bed to go to her, but something held me back. She went to the bed before mine, where my chum sleeps, and bent over him and looked at him. Then she came to me and kissed me ; I tried to kiss her but could not. Then she disappeared and seemed to vanish in a mist ; the face was the last thing I saw. I am quite sure that I was awake, and saw every object in the room when she was there.

(Signed) J. P. CHALLACOMBE.

The next statement, with which the above was enclosed, is from Mrs. Challacombe, the lad's mother.

42, RICHMOND ROAD, MONTPELIER, BRISTOL.

This is Jack's statement.

Now the queer part is that, at the time, I was visiting a cousin in Wales, and Jack knew nothing about it. The evening he speaks of I had returned home, and had removed all my walking things with the exception of my boots, dress and watch-chain. My dress Jack had never seen, and I am not in the habit of wearing my chain outside my dress. As for the boots they were a pair I had not worn for years, because they were in the habit of creaking.

I went to the door to wait for my cousin, who was a long time saying "good night" to a friend, and while there I was thinking deeply of Jack as I had not received his morning letter. We made an agreement when he went to boarding school that we would think of one another every night and also say "good night."

(Signed) ANNIE E. CHALLACOMBE.

August, 1898.

In reply to further enquiries, Master Challacombe writes thus :

August 27th, 1898.

I had never had any psychical experience before, and mother has never experienced anything of the kind either. As to the door of the bedroom being open, I do not

know anything about that. It is situated at the bottom of the stairs, so practically there is no door to the bedroom. Most probably it was shut, but I did not hear it open. As to the date, I remember it was a Sunday evening. I wrote home to mother the following Saturday, and she thought it was a strange coincidence, as she was away, and the date was March 20th. When I was home at Easter she questioned me about it. J. P. CHALLACOMBE.

The points of coincidence here are, first, that the supposed agent was specially thinking of her son, but this she tried to do every evening. Secondly, she was in fact, as in the apparition, wearing a dress her son had never seen, her gold watch-chain outside her dress, which was unusual, and a pair of creaking boots. Are these points sufficient to show that the mother's mind was concerned in the son's experience?

The next case (L. 1200, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 205)—a waking hallucination affecting two senses, sight and hearing—came to us from Mr. H. Arthur Smith, to whom all the witnesses concerned were intimately known. The percipient, Mr. Laurence Orchard, was in London on Christmas Day, 1913. His mother, whose phantasm he saw, was away from home, staying with another son in Canada. The percipient writes:

(1200.)

December 29th, 1913.

On Christmas Day at 12.50 p.m. I was in the bathroom, when I heard footsteps and doors being opened and closed quite distinctly, and as I was the only one in the house it surprised me, so [I] opened the door and looked out, and to my astonishment I saw Mother (or thought I did) in a black dress at her bedroom door and her arms full of parcels. I made an exclamation—"Mother," I think—and I think there was some sort of response, but I forget now, and then all disappeared suddenly. I then left the house, and told Gerty what a vision I had had, when I saw her at E——'s.

I suppose Mother having been so much in all our minds, and no doubt we in hers, made me see "things," but it was the noise that attracted my notice first.

"E." was a married sister, whose family gathering, in another part of London, they joined on Christmas Day.

Miss Gertrude Orchard gives a very full account of her brother's report of his experience to her on the same afternoon, which I do not reproduce here. She adds :

"It was a wonderful experience, and startled him very much, as it did me when he told me; in fact, I can't get it out of my mind. It haunts me night and day; but each day, now, I feel happier about it, as [my brother] G—— would surely have cabled by this time if anything serious had happened. . . ."

Enquiries were made of Mrs. Orchard, the percipient's mother, as to her doings on that day. It is clear from her replies printed in the *Journal* that she was thinking very much and in a special manner of the members of her family in England, and there may have been a telepathic impulse from her in consequence. But, on the other hand, sensory hallucinations can occur without any discoverable external impulse, and there was apparently nothing significant in the appearance, and nothing which the percipient could not have contributed from his own mind.

A somewhat similar case is the following (L. 896, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 174), but the impression was tactile. It was sent by the same Professor Thomas Davidson, who contributed one of the letter cases (see above, p. 310). The percipient, Mr. Alfred Hicks, an Englishman living at New York, writes on March 31st, 1889 :

(L. 896.)

There has always been a keen sympathy, and a great deal of affection existing between my mother and myself,

and early in February I sent over a letter to England to be given to her on her birthday, the 22nd of February.

I was staying at the time at 64, East 11th-street, N.Y. city. Very early in the morning of that day I was awakened from my sleep, and seemed to feel quite distinctly my mother's arms folded round me. I, too, seemed to have clasped her in my arms, and her head was resting on my shoulder. I seemed to be saying something to her in what I should judge was Italian, but as I do not know that language I can only give it phonetically. [There is no explanation of this imitation Italian.]

I was so impressed with the whole occurrence that I arose and looked at the time. It was just 3.30 a.m. I was quite awake when this seemed to occur, and did not sleep again that morning, but lay awake thinking it over.

Mr. Hicks calculated that his dream in America occurred just about the time his mother would receive his birthday letter, at which moment she would of course think vividly of him. The approach of the birthday would also, however, make him think specially of her and perhaps dream of her. His experience was very likely the continuation of a dream.

A case of the comparatively rare phenomenon of an apparition speaking is L. 1073, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 253. It was carefully recorded within two days of its occurrence by the percipient, Mr. E. White, an old gentleman of eighty-seven. He saw by his bed his landlady, with whom he had lodged for twelve years, and who habitually called him in the morning; but instead of her usual remark she said, "This is a bad day for you." She then moved towards the door, and he did not stop her to ask what she meant. By his watch, which he looked at, it was 2.10 a.m. He found afterwards that his landlady was seriously ill during the night with influenza and had even thought she was going to die. It seems quite certain that she had not left her bed during the night, and she was confined to bed for several days. Neither

he nor she can suggest any cause for the appearance, and she is not aware of having thought of him specially. The coincidence here is with the first night of acute illness, but the illness had been coming on for some days. No idea of illness seems to have been suggested by the apparition.

The next case (L. 950, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 29) from the Rev. Sören Pederson, Pastor of the Scandinavian Church of Melbourne, Australia, presents a rather unusual type of hallucination. He writes :

(L. 950.)

January 12th, 1892.

I saw a very dear friend, about 70 years old, living in Christiania, at 7 o'clock in the afternoon, when walking about a year ago with some Australian friends in one of the streets of Melbourne. I saw his face as in prayer, and quite suddenly and near, so I did almost touch him. I was talking of singing with my friends, as we were going to practice at the time. I was quite well and have never had hallucinations or anything like this before or later. It was daylight and quite full of passers-by and vehicles, etc., in the street.

I had not seen him since a year before, but it struck me so vividly that I wrote home to Christiania, Norway, asking what did friend G. at that hour (subtracting the 9 hours we are before here in Melbourne) and got the answer : "Praying *very* intensely for you and your mission in Melbourne."

Two [other persons were present] who saw nothing and were quite outside the whole incident.

I put this among ambiguous cases because I do not think the evidence for the coincidence, which is given in the *Journal*, quite conclusive. Mr. Pederson's letter to his parents had been lost, and so had Mr. G.'s notes fixing the date of what seems to have been a kind of prayer meeting among a few friends. Still some pains were taken at the time to establish the fact of the

coincidence; and the praying seems to have been something special, not an everyday occurrence. The probability is, I think, that this was a genuine case of telepathy.

In another case (L. 962, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 165) the coincidence does not seem, on the face of it, to be so marked. A gentleman, Mr. L. S. M. Munro, sitting at his writing table in a room looking out on a public thoroughfare, saw the face of a child friend looking in at the window. No real person was there, nor apparently could have been. He wrote at once to the child, and heard from her and her mother that just about the time of the apparition they had been having a conversation about him, which was unusual. First-hand evidence from them is not forthcoming.

In another case (L. 1198, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 149), which must, I think, be regarded as ambiguous, the percipient's experience seems to have been of the nature of a vision (see above, pp. 243, 248), though it is not quite easy to understand from the description what it exactly was, or what was the relation of the phantasm to surrounding objects. The percipient says: "I found myself sitting up in bed and lighting the candle. And then I saw an old woman in bed and I was quite conscious that she was dying." The face was clearly seen but not recognised. It was afterwards learnt that an old friend of the percipient's hostess, not known to the percipient, was very ill at the time. Sickness and pain had set in that night and she died less than thirty-six hours later. When the vision occurred her illness was unknown to anyone in the house where the percipient was, and if there was telepathy it must, it would seem, have been of an indirect kind, coming through the non-perceptive hostess to the percipient.

The next case (L. 1156, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 27) is interesting as an apparition, but ambiguous from the telepathic point of view, for the supposed agent's contemporary appearance and occupation was ordinary enough

for the correspondence with the apparition to be plausibly attributed to chance, and there is no evidence that her mind was at the time in any way directed to the percipient. The interest of the case lies in the movement, the persistence, and the mode of disappearance of the apparition, and in the fact that the dog may have been a co-percipient. He certainly either simultaneously saw something or was affected as if he had by the emotion and behaviour of the percipient. The case was received through Mr. Andrew Lang, the percipient, Miss B. H. Grieve, being his niece. She wrote the following account in a letter to her uncle :

(L. 1156.)

SKELFHILL, HAWICK, N.B., *August 8th, 1906.*

. . . I have been staying here since August 4th. On Monday, 6th, I went up the Pen and for the first time in my life saw a 'ghost!' Turk, the old Dandie Dinmont, was with me; and Mrs. R., a Swiss lady also staying here, had said she would go too, but it was hot, and in the end she stayed at home. Turk and I went very slowly, taking many rests on account of his short legs and shorter breath, and the grass and brackens were long and strong. Our last stop was where the Pen suddenly takes up for its rocky top very steeply. I sat with my back against the dyke facing the steep part, and Turk lay panting beside me. I was thinking of a beautiful clecking of grouse we had just disturbed—the two parent birds and five young ones clapped about four yards from us. Turk did not see them at first and I stood perfectly still watching, they were so pretty. Then Turk winded them and threw up his head, and of course with the movement the birds were off like a whirlwind. This just to show you my train of thought. Quite suddenly I saw coming along at right angles to me, a friend, Dr. H., who crossed with me May, 1905, from America. She was in a rather short dark blue skirt, white cotton blouse, no hat, and a stick in her hand—and later, I noticed a tail of hair beginning to 'come down.' I had heard about fortnight ago that she had landed in England from

America and was to sail back Sept. 12, and that she was going to her home in Cornwall for part of the time—but when I did not know. I was so surprised I did not say anything for a second or two till Turk began to growl. Then I jumped up exclaiming ‘Dr. H.!’ She looked straight at me, but when I spoke, turned and went on down the hill—following her own direction and the one from which I had come. I followed quickly to catch her up, feeling rather queer because she did not speak, and *I knew she had seen me!* Turk barked and growled the whole time, but kept close in to my heels and would not run out as he usually does at strange people or strange dogs. His hair was all on end and his tail hooked over his back, as stiff as a poker. I almost caught up Dr. H., and was just going to put out my hand to touch her shoulder, when a big bumble bee whirled between us and flew *right through* Dr. H. and she disappeared.

I certainly did feel queer after that—I was so very sure it was she and it was such a shock to find there was nothing. Had it not been for Turk I should have doubted my senses; but he was so unmistakably disturbed and angry. I swear I am well—never was better, and have had nothing stronger to drink than water for over a year. The exact moment of the apparition I cannot quite give you, but it was 6.5 p.m. when I sat down, and 6.15 perhaps a minute or even two minutes after it had disappeared.

I had a pencil and envelope in my pocket and made a rough note of it there on the top of the Pen, and wrote it out in detail when I got down here to the house. Of course I have written (yesterday) to Dr. H. to know whatever she was doing at that date and hour, and will let you know her reply—probably bathing at Tintagel! . . .

Miss Grieve wrote later :

September 23rd, 1906.

I was sitting when I first saw the figure, so also was Turk, though he collected his wits quicker than I, for he barked before I spoke. Truly I am certain I was not asleep, though one cannot deny the possibility. Dr. H.

has since stayed with me here, and should by now have landed in America. She said on that day and hour she was coming down their hill at Tintagel in the clothes I described, but with a wet bathing gown on her arm, which I did not see.

The statement in the last sentence is confirmed by Dr. H.'s sister.

The percipient in this case was the same Miss Grieve who shared in the collective crystal vision described above, p. 48. She afterwards, in 1908, had a curious experience of seeing a ghostly pointing hand in a church at Stavanger, her account of which is given in an article by Mr. Andrew Lang in the *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 65.¹ The experience tallied curiously with a story of a pointing ghost in the same church which she subsequently found in *Norwegian Byways* by C. W. Wood, but she had no recollection whatever of ever having seen or heard the story before.

There are three cases which on the face of them may have been collective hallucinations caused telepathically from outside, but in which there is evidential weakness both concerning the agency and the percipency. In the first (L. 844, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 289), if there was an agent, it was a dog. Mrs. Beauchamp writes to a friend :

(L. 844.)

Last night—Megatherium [a small Indian dog] sleeping with [my daughter]—I woke, hearing him run round my bedroom. I know his step so well. [My husband] woke too. I said "Listen." He said, "It is Meg." We lighted a candle, looked well, there was nothing and the door was shut. Then I had a feeling something was wrong with the dog—it came into my head he had died at this minute, and I looked for my watch to see the time, and then I thought I must go up and see about him. It was so cold, and it seemed so silly, and while I was thinking I fell asleep. It must have been some

¹ In this article Mr. Lang discusses the dog's share in the above case, and gives another account of a dog sharing in a hallucination, but it had happened six years previously.

little time after, someone knocked at the door, and it was [my daughter] in agony. "Oh! mamma, Meg is dying." We flew upstairs. He was lying on his side like dead—his legs stretched straight out like a dead thing's. [My husband] picked him up, and for a while couldn't see what was wrong, for he was *not* dead. Then we found he had nearly strangled himself—got the strap of his coat somewhat from under his stomach and round his neck. He soon revived and recovered when we got it off, and he could breathe freely.

Asked some months later, Colonel Beauchamp said he had paid so little attention to the circumstance at the time that he could not undertake to write an independent account. It is not possible to ascertain whether the dog's distress had begun at the time of Mrs. Beauchamp's experience. Even therefore, if it is certain that no real sound was mistaken for the patter of the dog, the coincidence must remain doubtful.

In another auditory case (G. 277, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 54) a strong impression was evidently made on the two percipients, but the hallucinatory nature of the sound—"a tremendous bang" of an alarming character on the door of the room—is from the nature of the case somewhat open to doubt; and the relation between it and an external event—the unknown and unexpected death some twenty-four hours¹ before of the father of a boy in the house, but not in the room—is highly conjectural.

The third case (L. 1190, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 289) was visual. A hospital patient told the nurse in the morning that he had seen the matron come into the ward in the night, look at the fire and go out again, and, when appealed to, a second patient confirmed this. There could hardly be a mistake of identity, as the matron's uniform was markedly unlike that of the nurses. The matron was

¹ The death occurred in India, and the time correction seems to have been made the wrong way in the *Journal*, where it is stated that the interval between death and the percipient's experience was about thirteen hours.

in bed at the time. It was during the coal strike of 1912, and the account came to us through the matron, who was interested in it because it seemed to reflect the anxious thought about how to save fuel with which her mind was occupied when she went to bed. The coincidence cannot be regarded as a well-marked one, and moreover the percipients had been lost sight of and the account of their experience comes from the nurse to whom they spoke, and is not therefore at first hand.

I come now to ambiguous cases where the difficulty is to find the agent. The first case I will give (L. 1212, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 51) seems to me a very interesting one. The experience of the percipient, Dr. George Johnston, was a dream or vision between waking and sleeping. For the reasons he gives it is, I think, difficult to doubt that the certainty of his son being dead which came to him through his experience was due to a supernormal communication. If this communication came from his son, the case does not properly belong to this paper, as the interval between death and phantasm exceeds the twelve hours' limit adopted. On this hypothesis, however, it is difficult to explain the complicated symbolism, without any suggestion of direct communication from the son, through which the fact of his death was expressed. On the other hand, if we suppose the persons looking over the kit to be the agents, how was the telepathic link with the percipient, whose very existence was probably unknown to them, brought about? Is it possible that there was some kind of combined agency involving the dead man and others? There is no means of knowing, and we can only record the case as part of the whole evidence to be considered. Dr. Johnston writes :

(L. 1212.)

23, SEYMOUR STREET, PORTMAN SQUARE, W.,
March 15, 1917.

My son, Lieut. Alec Leith Johnston, of the 1st King's Shropshire L.I., was killed at daybreak on Saturday, April 22nd, 1916.

At daybreak on the next morning, Easter Sunday, about 24 hours after his death took place, when I was lying half awake and half asleep, I had the vision or dream, an account of which follows.

I saw two soldiers in khaki standing beside a pile of clothing and accoutrements which, in some way, I *knew* to be Alec's, and my first feeling was one of anger and annoyance that they should be meddling with his things, for they were apparently looking through them and arranging them. Then one of them took up a khaki shirt which was wrapped round something so as to form a kind of roll. He took hold of one end of it and let the rest drop so that it unrolled itself and a pair of heavy, extremely muddy boots fell out and banged heavily on the floor, and something else fell which made a metallic jingle. I thought "That is his revolver," but immediately afterwards thought "No, it is too light to be his revolver, which would have made more of a clang."

As these things fell out on to the floor the two men laughed, but a sad wistful kind of laugh with no semblance of mirth in it. And then the words "Alec is dead and they are going through his kit," were most clearly borne in upon my mind. They were not spoken and I heard no voice, but they were just as clear as if I had done so. And then I became fully awake with these words repeating themselves in my mind and with the fullest conviction of their truth which I never lost. I suppose I still tried to persuade myself that it might not be true, but it was useless and when the official telegram arrived it only confirmed what I already knew.

GEORGE JOHNSTON.

In a letter of the same date, March 15, 1917, Dr. Johnston adds the following comments on his statement:

. . . Two points have to be borne in mind in estimating the importance of the dream as an intimation of my son's death and not as a mere coincidence.

(1) He went out to the front in October, 1914, and was there continuously (with three short leaves) until his

death on April 22nd, 1916—Easter Saturday. During these eighteen months I never had any dream or any impression of his being in serious danger, although I often knew that he was in the midst of hard fighting and he was wounded in three places in August, 1915, at Hoge.

(2) At the time when I had the dream I was under the impression that his battalion was resting and that they would not be in the fighting line until the middle of the week. Hence my mind was quite easy about him and I was not feeling at all anxious. In the ordinary course of events they were not due in the trenches until the Wednesday, but they were unexpectedly called upon on the evening of Good Friday to move up at once to recapture a trench which had been taken by the Germans some days before. It was after having accomplished this, and whilst the position was being consolidated, that he was killed.

I have never in my life had any dream so vivid as this one was, and when I saw in the Sunday papers that his battalion had accomplished this "fine feat," as they called it, I had no doubt whatever that my boy was dead. When the official telegram came on the Wednesday I felt that it was hardly necessary to open it. . . .

I shall always think (as a nephew does to whom I told my dream on the Sunday afternoon), that this vision was Alec's way of letting me know what had happened.

A minor point that may be worth noticing is that when I heard the metallic clink when the shirt unrolled and let its contents fall on the floor, I at first thought "That is his revolver," but then immediately thought the noise was too "jingly" to be made by the fall of a heavy service Colt such as he had. When his things came home, however, I found that instead of having a Colt he had a light French automatic pistol which, in falling, would have made exactly such a sound as I heard.

I do not suppose that his kit was actually being gone through at the time of my dream, nor do I think that

it makes much difference whether it were so or not. But the regimental surgeon (since killed himself) who came to see me early in June told me that he believed that they really were going through Alec's things about the time of my dream.

GEORGE JOHNSTON.

In a subsequent letter he writes :

March 25th, 1917.

. . . The only person whom I told the dream to, before the arrival of the War Office telegram, was my nephew who was here on Sunday, the 23rd April [1916].

I enclose the letter which he sent me when he had definite news of Alec's death.

I also enclose a copy of part of a letter which the regimental surgeon (since killed) wrote to his father. I do this in order to show the conditions under which the attack was made, especially as to mud.

One does not want to read too much into such an experience, but I have often thought that what I saw had a certain amount of symbolism in it. The fact that the boots which fell out of the rolled-up shirt were so exceedingly muddy, and that the other thing which dropped out was, as I at first thought, his revolver, point to the terribly muddy conditions of the attack and to the fact that it *was* an attack, for otherwise the revolver would not have been carried. But this is a minor point.

GEORGE JOHNSTON.

The letter from Dr. Johnston's nephew, Mr. N. C. Reid, to which reference is made above, began as follows :

May 4, 1916.

I hear that Alec has died at Ypres. Your dream has come true. Alec appears to have been trying to let you know. . . .

N. C. REID.

The reference in the above letter to Dr. Johnston's dream implies that Mr. Reid had heard of it before he heard of Lieut. Johnston's death, but we asked also for an independent statement from Mr. Reid that Dr. Johnston had related his dream to him on the day on which it occurred, April 23,

1916, before Dr. Johnston himself knew of its verification. In reply Mr. Reid wrote as follows :

2/7 ESSEX REGT., HARROGATE, YORKS.,
April 3, 1917.

I have been asked by my uncle, Dr. George Johnston, to send you a statement to the effect that he told me of the dream or vision which he had of his son's death before actual confirmation.

This I can do.

I was spending the afternoon of Easter Sunday last year (April 23, 1916) at his house, and while at tea he came in from paying a professional visit somewhere.

After tea he spoke to me of his dream. I regret to say I cannot remember all he said, but I do recollect his saying he saw two officers looking over and packing his son's kit. He was angry at their meddling, but it suddenly dawned upon him that his son was dead. Whether Alec Johnston appeared in the dream I forget.

Some days afterwards I heard that Alec Johnston was dead, confirmation having reached him, Dr. Johnston, on a date after the 23rd April. N. C. REID.

As regards the circumstances under which Lieut. Johnston lost his life, we print below extracts from the letter to which Dr. Johnston refers on March 25, written by the regimental surgeon :

April 27th, 1916.

. . . You will have seen by the papers about the gallant attack the Btn. made the other night to retake some trenches lost by another Btn. It was as the Army Commander said, "A magnificent feat of arms," and you can guess what the higher command thought of it when they honoured the regiment by mentioning them by name—an honour which has only been paid twice all the time out here. Unless one is on the spot though one could not realise the conditions under which the attack was made or the apparently hopeless job it seemed. I don't think any other Btn. could have done it. The mud, to take one point only, was so deep that the men

had to throw themselves down and crawl—putting their rifles and bombs ahead a few feet and then struggling up to them. Of course the rifles were so covered with mud that they could not shoot, so the men just struggled on till they could use the bayonet. We had men utterly engulfed in the mud and suffocated. It was a glorious achievement, and the cost was heavy. . . . Johnston—who used to write “At the Front” in *Punch*—was shot through the heart gallantly superintending his company consolidating the captured position. As dawn broke he was so busy with so much to see to that he would not take cover, but kept on walking from end to end of the trench over the top to save time. He was picked off by a sniper.

T. I.

In a letter to Dr. Johnston from one of Lieut. Johnston's fellow-officers, giving an account of his death, the muddy condition of the ground is again emphasised. He writes:

May 7, 1916.

. . . As you know the conditions were simply awful. Pitch dark, and wading up to our waists in mud. . . .

The next case (L. 1206, *Journal*, Vol. XVII., p. 212) is again an experience at the moment of waking. Mrs. Fuller-Maitland wrote to her brother, Sir Lawrence Jones, on April 25, 1916:

(L. 1206.)

On Friday afternoon [April 21, 1916] I was very tired and went to lie down about 3.30. I fell asleep for a few minutes, and as I woke up I had a distinct vision of the big room in the R.A. and Edward's [Mr. Fuller Maitland] picture hanging on the left of the door as you go in from the second room. I came down and said to E., “Your picture is in and is hung in the big room high up on the left of the door.” The next morning he got his in-notice, and yesterday he went up for varnishing day and found his picture in the big room on the left of the door high up! I saw the room as plainly as possible,

and it was quite empty, two or three men in it and no red velvet sofas. Mr. Powles says they judge the pictures in that room and that probably the sofas are removed. [It has been ascertained that this conjecture is right.]

Sir Lawrence Jones corroborates Mrs. Fuller-Maitland's statement, as follows :

39, HARRINGTON GARDENS, S.W., *June 2, 1916.*

The picture is hung on the right of the door from Room No. 2, as you enter, but on the left as you look at [it] from the big room itself. My sister says that she seemed to be standing at the end of the room and that the picture seemed to her about a third of the way down the wall. This is about correct.

LAWRENCE J. JONES.

In reply to a request for a corroborative statement, Mr. Fuller-Maitland wrote :

WOOD RISING, RYE, SUSSEX, *June 10, 1916.*

I am sending, as you request, an independent account of my wife's veridical dream. On Good Friday afternoon [April 21, 1916] my wife told me that she had just had a vision of my larger picture (I sent another which was also kept back but not hung) hung on the right of the door of the large room, as you enter, and rather high up. I asked her to put her impressions down in writing, which unfortunately she did not do, but she told Mr. Powles in my presence. It was, as I told her at the time, extremely unlikely that I should be hung in the coveted large room, if hung at all, especially as the picture is relatively small.

The following morning I received my varnishing ticket, and on Monday went straight to the place she mentioned, where I saw my picture. EDWARD FULLER-MAITLAND.

Mr. Powles also corroborates.

It is unfortunate that Mrs. Fuller-Maitland's original letter leaves it doubtful whether she meant to the left

of the door as you pass through it from the second room to the big room or as you face it from the big room. But her subsequent account to her brother seems to make it clear that in the dream she looked at the door from the large room. In any case she was right as to which of two pictures was hung, in which room, and which wall of that room. But from whom did the impression come? The case somewhat resembles the dreams about the date of a brother's appointment and place in examination given in Chapter II. (P. 269, p. 144, and L. 1127, p. 147).

A very odd case of this clairvoyant kind (L. 1119, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 227) I will describe briefly. It came to us from Mrs. E. Thompson, who, however, only knew the percipient, a Mrs. Hodgson of Shepherd's Bush, slightly. The account, written by Mrs. Thompson and signed by Mrs. Hodgson and her daughter, is dated June 12th, 1899, and relates to a dream in October, 1897. A burglary had occurred at Mrs. Hodgson's house on September 30th, 1897, and among other things a small papier-maché box which she valued had been taken. About a week later she dreamed she went into the coal cellar and found it hidden amongst the fine coal. She told her daughter of the dream the next morning, but it seemed so absurd that no search was made. In August, 1898, Mr. Hodgson went into the cellar to see how much coal there was, and found amongst the fine coal the lost box wrapped in a newspaper of the date of the burglary. Had somebody played a trick? Or had Mrs. Hodgson subconsciously noticed the box in its hiding place before her dream? Or what had happened? We know too little of the circumstances to judge.

The following case (M.Cl. 87, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 264) which came to us through the American Branch, if it was not merely a remarkable coincidence, takes us from matters of purely private concern to an event which was also, one may say, one of public interest. But this does not seem to help us to find the agent, or to explain the nature of the supernormal perception. The account to be

quoted was first published in a newspaper and afterwards signed by the percipient. Later Dr. Hodgson obtained the corroboration of members of the percipient's family to his having told them of his experience before the news of the explosion came.

(M. Cl. 87.)

The bank at Coldwater, Michigan, was robbed about the middle of February, 1892, of \$20,000 by the blowing up of the safe with dynamite. The following statement appeared in a Coldwater newspaper of March 16, 1892, and was afterwards signed as correct by Mr. S. P. Williams :

S. P. Williams, a large stockholder in the Coldwater National Bank, lives at Lima, Ind. [thirty miles distant from Coldwater]. While asleep at his home during the night upon which the bank was robbed, he awoke under the impression that he had been startled by a heavy explosion. So vivid was the impression left that he got up, dressed himself, and walked all through the business portion of Lima looking for evidences of a big explosion. Of course he found none, and later ascertained that he awoke at the same time at which the vault in the Coldwater bank was blown open.

Members of Mr. Williams's family testify that he told them of his impression before the news of the explosion came.

There remain cases under this head furnished by two percipients—each of whom had on two occasions dreams concerning public events in the war without apparently any traceable private reason. First (L. 1201, *Journal*, Vol. XVI., p. 306) Miss "Ann Jones" (pseudonym), who has sent us other telepathic experiences (see above, pp. 317, 330), on August 6th, 1914, from 8.30 p.m. to 9, and again on Sept. 5th, 1914, from 2.30 p.m. to 7, fell into a heavy swoon-like state between sleeping and waking unlike anything she had experienced before. During this she had each time a dream or impression of a sinking

ship. The notes in her diary run "Had a bad dream of a ship sunk," "Had a dreadful drowning sleep," for the two dates respectively; and friends testify that she told them she had dreamt of a sinking ship. On August 6th H.M.S. *Amphion* struck a mine and foundered at 7.30 a.m.—that is, about thirteen hours before Miss Jones' dream. This was announced by the Admiralty that evening, but not known to Miss Jones or her friends. On September 5th, at 4.30 p.m., H.M.S. *Pathfinder* struck a mine and foundered very rapidly. This was probably before or about the time of Miss Jones' dream. These two disasters were, I understand, the only two which had befallen the British fleet in the war up to that date. The heavy sleep seems rather to have been the opportunity for the impression to emerge than itself caused by the impression, for it began long after the disaster on August 6th and two hours before it on Sept. 5th. At the same time it is odd that this peculiar physical condition should, so far as we know, have occurred on these occasions only.

In the other case (L 1214, *Journal*, Vol. XVIII., p. 92) Miss M. S. Wilkinson on two occasions (Aug. 21-22/17 and Sept. 2-3/17) dreamt vividly of an air-raid on a night when one actually took place at a distance, but when there was no special reason to expect one. At the same time, air-raids were fairly frequent, so that the coincidence does not seem very striking, and I only mention this case for completeness.

CHAPTER IV.

COLLECTIVE AND RECIPROCAL CASES WITHOUT EVIDENCE
OF ANY AGENCY EXTERNAL TO THE PERCIPIENT.§ 1. *Similar and Simultaneous Dreams.*

In this final chapter I have put together cases in which two or more persons have at the same time spontaneous psychical experiences—either hallucinations or dreams—which seem to be related to one another, but where no evidence of any agency outside the two percipients exists.¹ When this happens—when two persons have nearly similar dreams or hallucinations without traceable external cause, normal or supernormal—it can hardly be attributed to chance, and we seem driven to suppose that they have influenced each other either by suggestion through the senses, or telepathically—one being agent and the other percipient; or both acting in both capacities so that the telepathic influence is mutual.

In most of the cases we have to examine, the two persons concerned were in the same room, or otherwise near each other, which makes it specially important to consider whether they can have influenced each other through the senses. In similar and simultaneous dreams, for instance—which I propose to take first—it does not

¹ There are collective cases, it will be remembered, not fulfilling these conditions. A collective crystal vision, not spontaneous, has been given in Chapter I. (L. 1126, p. 48). And collective cases where more or less evidence of external agency is adduced have been discussed under their appropriate heads. They are: Simultaneous dreams, L. 1210, p. 268, L. 1138, p. 271; Collective apparitions, L. 1159, p. 194, L. 1190, p. 343; Non-vocal sounds collectively heard, L. 1141, p. 242, L. 1151, p. 242, L. 844, p. 342, G. 277, p. 343.

seem impossible that in some cases where the dreamers are sleeping together and the element common to the two dreams is sufficiently simple, a sound or movement made by one dreamer might suggest the dream to the other. And, of course, in any case where suggestion through the senses can be regarded as an adequate cause for the similarity of two dreams or hallucinations, no room is left for evidence of telepathy, even if telepathy has occurred. Whether suggestion through the senses seems a likely cause in any of the dreams that follow I must leave the reader to judge.

The first case (L. 835, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 220) came from Mr. and Mrs. H., who do not wish their names to be published. The dreams took place in July, 1887, and the account was sent to us in August.

(L. 835.)

I dreamt that I was walking in Richmond Park with my husband and Mr. J. I saw notices put on several trees to the effect that "In consequence of the Jubilee Lady R. will give a garden party on the 24th of June." I remarked to my husband that I hoped she would invite us. My husband said that he hoped she would not do so, as it would be extremely difficult to get back to town. Mr. J. then said, "Oh, I will manage that for you," and struck a blade of grass with his stick, upon which a carriage drove up. I then awoke and my husband said, "I have had such a vivid dream. I dreamt we were walking in Richmond Park, and I was told that Lady R. was going to have a party. We were invited, and I was very much troubled in my mind as to how we should get home, as the party was at 10, and the last train went at 11, when my friend J., who was walking with us, said, 'Oh, I will manage that for you.' "

(Signed) M. H. and J. B. H.

In the next case (L. 965, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 169), which came through the American Branch, the coincidence is less striking, because the main subject of the dreams

was a likely one to arise in the minds of both dreamers. Moreover, the records were made about two years after the dreams. I will give the case briefly, omitting corroboration and the second dreamer's account.

(L. 965.)

Mr. Armstrong writes to Dr. Hodgson :

LEHMANN'S, LA., *March 20th*, 1893.

I was staying at the house of a young friend of mine, who at the time was infatuated with a young lady in the neighbourhood. His parents, as well as myself, were opposed to the alliance, and our conversation would often centre on the subject. One night I dreamed that he was determined to marry the girl. Everything was prepared, and I remember hurrying off to the place where the ceremony was to take place. I even forgot to put on my coat. I found him in a back room of the house, where I also saw his father, vainly trying to change his mind. I called my young friend to the side, and talked to him like a Dutch uncle, trying to persuade him out of the notion. Then I left the scene, and went home in disgust. Now, we were sleeping in the same room and in the same bed, and after awaking in the morning, and before telling him of my dream, I asked what he had been dreaming about. He, half smilingly, answered, "Why, I dreamt that I was about to get married, when you came rushing in the house, in shirt-sleeves, and insisted that the ceremony must not go on."

The unlikely item of the shirt-sleeves in both dreams makes it probable that they were not independent. Otherwise they were not quite identical.

The next two cases also came to us through the American Branch. In the first (L. 1162, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 119) we have again different dreams, with an important common element, which in this case is the central point of the dreams, namely, the drowning and rescue.

(L. 1162.)

June 18th, 1899.

Noticing your address in the N.Y. *Sunday Journal* of even date, I write to tell you of an instance of telepathy in which, as an additional straw, your Society may find interest.

In the summer of '97, one night while sleeping I dreamed that I was in an old, abandoned and ruined saw-mill, which was built on timbers out over a river. The plank floor was gone except for now and then a plank, and the water, about eight feet below, looked black, stagnant and slimy. There were just enough planks and timbers left to cause a "creepy," shadowy darkness to prevail below. There were two ladies came to look at the place, and being afraid to trust the planks for footing, I took one on each arm, and was proceeding out to the further end of the ruin, over the water to where the old saw was, when something white glimmering in the water below through the dusk attracted my attention, and I saw it to be the face of my wife, Mrs. D., just showing above the water, with her large eyes looking into mine, but without a motion or sound. I immediately jumped into the water and caught her round the shoulders and neck to support her, and at that instant was roused from sleep by a smothered cry from Mrs. D. at my side. Intuitively I knew how matters were and asked her (after shaking her to awaken her) what she had dreamed to frighten her.

She said that she was dreaming that she was in the water drowning and was trying to reach up her arms to help herself, and cried out as I heard her. . . .

Mrs. D. wrote to Dr. Hodgson :

June 22nd, 1899.

In reply to your letter of the 20th to Mr. Davis, relating to our "dreams," I will relate my experience as perfectly as possible.

The first sensation I remember in my dream was of finding myself sinking in a pool, a large pool, or pond

of water by the roadside, and of throwing up my arms above the water and trying to scream for help, and just as I felt my hand grasped by some one, I could not tell by whom, to help me, Mr. Davis spoke and I awoke.

I sometimes have unpleasant dreams and make a slight sound, when he always wakens me, but we both thought it remarkable when on this occasion we found that there was perfect coincidence in the time, even to a second, and almost perfect coincidence in the subject matter of our dreams.

Mr. D. sent to Dr. Hodgson on July 3rd, 1899, an account of an apparently telepathic impression that had occurred to him a few weeks before in regard to the death of a friend. He had had a strong impression of her presence, and that she told him she was dead. He informed his wife of this at the time, and they heard later the same day that the lady had died about 24 hours before the impression occurred. They knew, however, that she had been seriously ill, though it was believed that she was then recovering.

In the next case (L. 1161, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 118), sent to Dr. Hodgson by Dr. M. L. Holbrook, the dreams seem to have been identical as far as they both went. The following account of them was given by Mr. E. J. to his brother, Mr. G. J., an Associate of the American Branch :

(L. 1161.)

January 6, 1907.

My bed stands with the head against the west wall of the room, head next the door. Annie's bed stands directly opposite, head against the east wall, with a space of about six feet between them.

I dreamed on Friday night [January 4th] that mother came into the room, passed beside my bed, looked at me and went to the foot of Annie's bed. The impression was so strong that it awoke me.

I told my dream at breakfast and Annie remarked, "How queer that is; for I dreamed last night that your

mother came into the room, leant over the foot of my bed, with her arms crossed just as she always used to stand and talk when I was sick. She said that Fred told her that I did not realise how sick my mother was, and that she would not live three months, and that startled me so that I woke up."

About six weeks later Mr. E. J. sent a substantially similar account direct to Dr. Hodgson, and about this Mrs. J.'s secretary wrote on March 1, 1901:

In reply to your letter of Feb. 25, Mrs. J. directs me to say that she has nothing to add to or change to make in the statement made by Mr. J.

As regards the content of the dreams Mr. J.'s mother had died in 1883 and his brother Fred, whom his wife had never known, in 1858. Mrs. J.'s mother was aged 83 and had been expected to die at almost any time during the previous year, though at the moment she was better. She did actually die six months later on June 12th, 1901.

There is in our collection one case which may conveniently come in here (L. 1181, *Journal*, Vol. XIV., p. 380), in which one percipient sees an apparition, while the other, a child of $2\frac{1}{2}$ sleeping in the same room, has a vivid dream about the same person. It was sent to us by Mr. J. H. Clapham of King's College, Cambridge, who, in sending us Mrs. Clapham's account of the incident, says:

(L. 1181.)

Its main interest is that my appearance had no significance. I was comfortably asleep in a Swiss inn. Fortunately my diary has a note of the excellent night that I spent. . . .

Mrs. Clapham wrote to her husband:

55, BATEMAN STREET,
CAMBRIDGE, *Wednesday, Aug. 3, 1910.*

What were you doing this morning between 5 a.m. and 5.15? Such a strange thing happened. To the best of

my belief I was awake, for I had just been putting some lotion on the restless [Alison] and heard 5 o'clock strike. I turned round to face the window, to try and get off to sleep, and there were you standing by the bed looking down on me. I said, "John, what are you doing *here*?" but you said nothing, and walking round the bed you bent over Alison's cot and looked at her, and she stirred restlessly in her sleep and said, "Daddy, Daddy, I can't 'member." Then you came round and looked at me again, and by that time I was terrified, for I thought something must have happened to you. I said, "What have you come for?" and tried to touch you, but you retreated towards the window and disappeared. At that moment Alison woke and popped her head over her cot. I gave her her biscuit and looked at the clock; it was 5.15. I comforted myself by reflecting that you could hardly have begun to climb yet, but I haven't felt comfortable all day. When Alison came into my bed, she said, "Daddy was mowing the grass when I waked up." I told her you were away in Switzerland and not mowing the grass, but she said, "I *know* he was mowing the grass, 'cause I seed him." And again at breakfast, in the middle of demanding sugar, she suddenly said, "I *know* Daddy was mowing, I seed him doing it when I waked up." So if I was dreaming, she must also have been dreaming of you at the same time. . . .

If there was telepathy here, it was apparently between Mrs. Clapham and her little girl. But there is no evidence that their experiences were alike except in relating to the same person.

§ 2. *Collective Visual Hallucinations unrecognised.*

Coming now to simultaneous waking experiences, there are in our collection a good many cases of apparently sensory hallucinations shared by two (or more) percipients who are together, but where there is no evidence pointing to agency external to both. From one point of view suggestion by word or gesture may seem a more likely explanation of the coincidence in the case of waking

hallucinations than of dreams, for, as already remarked in another connexion, the content of a waking hallucination is usually simpler—less elaborate—than that of a dream. If, for instance, *A* sees an apparition of *C* in his usual garb and exclaims “there is *C*,” the remark would probably at once call up in *B*’s mind a more or less distinct and similar mental image of their common friend *C*, and it is conceivable that this mental image might externalise itself in space. This possibility must be kept in mind in the case of collective hallucinations, and especially of recognised apparitions. But, on the other hand, we are less suggestible awake than asleep, and to quote Gurney’s words, which are I think as true now as when they were written, “I do not know of any instance where the sane and healthy *A*, simply by saying at a casual moment to the sane and healthy *B*, ‘There is such and such an object’ (not really present and not capable of being imposed as an illusion on some object really present), has at once caused the object to be conjured up in space before *B*’s eyes. In the most extreme case that has come to my knowledge, where something like this has proved possible, very strong insistence and repetition on *A*’s part, of the sort that a mesmerist employs when seeking to dominate a subject’s mind, are needed before the impression develops into sensory form. In cases, therefore, where *A* has himself had a hallucination of which he has spoken at the moment, and *B* has shared it, it is too much to assume at once that *B*’s experience *must* have been exclusively due to the verbal suggestion; for if *A*’s mere suggestion can produce such an effect on *B* at that particular moment, why not at other moments when he suggests the imaginary object, without having himself seen it?”¹ None the less, of course, ought the hypothesis of verbal suggestion to be most carefully considered, in relation to the special circumstances of each case, before any other hypothesis is even provisionally

¹ It seems possible, though I think Gurney does not mention it, that verbal suggestion by *A* when startled by seeing an apparition might have a stronger hallucination-producing effect than the same suggestion from *A* unstartled and merely experimenting.

admitted" (see *Phantasms of the Living*, Chap. XVIII., § 3).

But there is a source of error (also discussed by Gurney, and referred to by him in the passage just quoted) to which dreams are not liable, for which each case of collective waking sensory hallucination has to be carefully examined; namely, the possibility that what is seen or heard is some real object misinterpreted, or some real person mistaken for another. This is a danger which, while it to some extent attaches to waking hallucinations generally, is of special importance in the case of collective hallucinations such as we have now to consider, because the interest of them depends entirely on their being really hallucinatory, and at the same time the fact that the experience is shared is itself a reason for suspecting that it has a real basis in some external object.

For this reason appearances seen in a bad light, or at a considerable distance, are apt to be of little evidential value, and I am disposed at once to dismiss two cases on this ground—the ground namely that though something odd happened we have not enough information to enable us to judge what its nature was.

In the first (G. 200, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 221), when "it was rapidly getting dusk" (7.15 p.m. on Sept. 22), a father and daughter riding together in a lane crossed at right angles by another lane saw pass across in front of them, as it might be along the other lane, a man with a slouch hat and "an old-fashioned shepherd's frock." He disappeared as they thought behind the corner of, or possibly through, the hedge, but though they rode on quickly to the corner they saw nothing more of him and nothing to account for the appearance. There was a vague tradition that the place was haunted. The case quoted in *Proceedings*, Vol. X., p. 100, may advantageously be compared with this.

In the other case (L. 1148, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 121) on a "very misty" evening in the middle of May in the north of England two ladies saw as they thought a cyclist

coming towards them on a moorland road. He suddenly disappeared, and they thought he might have got into the ditch or have fallen, but no man or machine was to be found.

Another case (G. 241, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 145) which also occurred in a very poor light is, I think, more curious and important, and deserves a fuller mention. The experience took place about a year and a half before it was recorded. The account of it was sent to us by Mr. T. Barkworth, now dead, who was at the time a Member of the Society and of its Council. He took down the evidence of the percipients, whom he calls Lady and Miss B., from word of mouth, and they attested the account with their signatures. The house where the occurrence took place was in a London square, and as to light he says, "There is only a gas lamp opposite the house, and the windows are provided with blinds of some thick stuff material, so that it seems difficult to understand how the figure was seen so clearly, unless it was to some extent self-luminous." Sounds (unaccounted for) as of footsteps and other noises had frequently been heard in the house, but I omit the account of these as it is stated that "no importance was attached to them till after the visual experience." This is described as follows:

(G. 241.)

Lady B. was sleeping in her own room . . . and Miss B. was sleeping in another bed at her side. In the middle of the night both ladies suddenly started up wide awake without any apparent cause, and saw a figure in a white garment, which might have been a night dress, with dark curly hair. The room was not quite dark, although there was no artificial light except from the gas lamp in the square. No fear nor any physical sensation was experienced. The figure was standing in front of the fireplace, over which was a mirror. The position was such as to show the face in quarter profile and to intercept its own reflection from the mirror. It was a female figure, with hair down the back. The

face, so far as shown, was clearly visible. The two ladies both spoke and sprang out of bed to the doors, which they found locked. On turning round again the figure had disappeared.

Miss B. . . . saw the back of the figure and its long dark hair, but not the face. The face was, however, clearly reflected in the mirror, and Miss B. saw it there distinctly. Like Lady B. she woke up suddenly, without assignable cause. The room seemed lighted up.

It would be natural to regard such an apparition on suddenly awaking from sleep, if it occurred to a single percipient, as probably the continuation of a dream image. But this seems less probable in a collective experience. For a case resembling this, see *Proceedings*, Vol. X., p. 312, and for one in which one of the percipients awakes suddenly to share in a waking hallucination of the other, see *Phantasms of the Living*, Vol. II. (1st ed.), Chap. XVIII., p. 204, case No. 323.

One characteristic which, when it occurs, is conclusive as to an appearance being hallucinatory is its vanishing before the eyes of a percipient. I mean by vanishing that it disappears, either gradually or suddenly, while the percipient is actually looking at it. I do not mean what, I think, happens more often, that it disappears behind some object, or that the percipient having, as in the last case, turned his eyes away sees nothing when he looks back. There are three cases of collectively seen apparitions which resemble the last in having occurred indoors in a poor light and in not having been recognised, but which differ from it in having apparently vanished at least for one percipient.

In the first of these (L. 842, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 286) :

(L. 842.)

The percipients were sons of Mr. Ellwood, a chemist residing at Leominster. From an account previously sent by Mr.

Ellwood, sen., it appeared that the percipients were respectively 19 and 23 years of age. The brothers were sleeping together, and the elder of the two was the writer of the following account. The first experience occurred on December 20th, 1889.

LEOMINSTER, *February 12th*, 1890.

The following is just a short account of what I saw on the first occasion mentioned. It was, I think, about 6 a.m., just getting light. I had been *awake* a short time and I suddenly heard the door open (the door was on the jar all night), and saw a short figure in a night-shirt walk in and stand looking at me by the side of the bed. I distinctly heard a sound of breathing or rustling of the nightshirt, and I thought at first that it was my father walking in his sleep. Then I thought it might be a burglar (although why a burglar should be dressed in a nightshirt I don't know), so I said, "What is it?" then I jumped out of bed and rushed to catch hold of the figure, when it vanished. My brother also saw the figure standing at the bedside, and after I jumped out of bed he saw the figure glide round towards the foot of the bed and then vanish. I did not see it after I jumped out of bed. We both searched well but could find nothing.

On the second occasion it was about the same hour in the morning and on the same day of the week. The bedroom door was shut all night on this occasion, and I was lying awake when I saw the door open and some one peep round. I thought it was one of our assistants come for a lark to pull me out of bed (as we do those kind of tricks sometimes); however, I lay still, and then the door seemed to open wide, so I leaned out of bed to give it a hard push and everything vanished, and I nearly fell out of bed, for the door was shut as when I went to bed. My brother was asleep this time and saw nothing.

I can positively swear that this is as correct an account as I can give, and I distinctly saw what I have mentioned. I was awake both times (not dozing, but distinctly awake).

I was also in good health and had not been up late, etc., the night before. I may add that before this occasion I did not believe in ghosts, or anything in that way. I really and truly thought a man was in the room, and I intended collaring him when I rushed at him.

W. M. ELLWOOD.

P.S.—I only saw the head of the second figure, but it was, as near as I could tell, like the first figure.—W. E.

To this account the younger Mr. Ellwood adds :

I also saw and heard all my brother did.

(Signed) M. J. ELLWOOD, JUN.

It occurred to Mr. Ellwood, senior, that the figure might be connected with his landlord, who was lying ill at the time and has since died. This gentleman was an intimate friend and had a special affection for Mr. Ellwood's younger son. He is also known to have interested himself in the place during his last illness. But no definite coincidence can be made out.

Mr. Ellwood also informed us that his house had the reputation of being haunted, but the only phenomena observed appear to have been unexplained noises before the deaths of several of Mrs. Ellwood's relatives.

Only one of the percipients in this case saw the phantasm vanish, but the hallucinatory character of the apparition seems pretty clear, and is confirmed by the second (non-collective) experience of one of the percipients, especially by the effort to shut the apparently open door resulting in reaching out into vacancy.

In the next case (G. 201, *Journal*, Vol. V., p. 223) the figure was seen by three percipients and appears to have vanished before the eyes of at least two of the three. Mr. Podmore refers briefly to this case in his *Apparitions and Thought Transference* but scarcely describes it, and both this and the two previously quoted cases are similarly referred to in *Proceedings*, Vol. X., p. 320.

(G. 201.)

The place where the following incident occurred is a very modern London house. Dr. Kingston, who obtained the narrative for us, tells us that "the young ladies looked out for the apparition on the same night of the following year, but saw nothing." We may assume, therefore, that at any rate mere expectation was not sufficient to produce the impression.

July 31st, 1891.

On the night of November 1st, 1889, between 9.30 and 10 p.m., my three sisters and myself left our library, where we had spent the evening, and proceeded upstairs to our bedrooms. On reaching my room, which is on the second floor, I and a sister went to the mantelpiece in search of the matchbox, in order to light the gas. I must here explain that my bedroom opens into my mother's, and the door between the two rooms was open.

There was no light beyond that which glimmered through the venetian blinds in each room. As I stood by the mantelpiece I was awe-struck by the sudden appearance of a figure gliding noiselessly towards me from the outer room. The appearance was that of a young man, of middle height, dressed in dark clothes, and wearing a peaked cap. His face was very pale, and his eyes down-cast as though deep in thought. His mouth was shaded by a dark moustache. The face was slightly luminous, which enabled us to distinguish the features distinctly, although we were without a light of any kind at the time.

The apparition glided onwards towards my sisters, who were standing inside the room, quite close to the outer door, and who had first caught sight of it, reflected in the mirror. When within a few inches from them it vanished as suddenly as it appeared. As the figure passed we distinctly felt a cold air which seemed to accompany it. We have never seen it again, and cannot account in any way for the phenomenon.

One of my sisters did not see the apparition, as she was looking the other way at the moment, but felt a cold air; the other two, however, were *eye-witnesses* with myself to the fact.

Signed by

{ LOUISA F. DU CANE.
F. A. DU CANE.
M. DU CANE.
C. A. DU CANE.

August 4th, 1891.

Answers to questions [asked by Dr. Kingston] respecting apparition.

There was no light of any kind in passage outside the rooms.

We had not been talking or thinking of ghosts during the evening, or reading anything exciting; neither were we the least nervous.

None of us had ever before been startled by anything unexpected in the dark or twilight.

It was not light enough to see each other's faces, as the only illumination there was came through the venetian blinds, which were drawn down.

It was myself, Louisa Du Cane, who first saw the apparition.

We three sisters who saw it exclaimed at the same moment, and found we had seen the same thing.

My sister Mary did not see the figure, as she was looking the other way at the time but felt distinctly, as did the rest of us, a sensation of cold when the figure passed us.

We did not recognise the figure as anybody we had ever seen.


We did not afterwards hear of any event that we could connect with the appearance.

LOUISA F. DU CANE.

Mrs. Sidgwick writes :

The Misses Du Cane kindly allowed me to call on them on December 2nd, 1891, and showed me the rooms where

their experience occurred. The following is a rough plan of them, the dotted line showing the course apparently taken by the figure.



A, A, A, windows. B, B, B, doors. C, mantelpiece by which Miss Louisa Du Cane stood, D, mantelpiece with mirror over it, in which Misses F. and C. Du Cane first saw the figure. E, place where I was told a bookcase stood at the time of the incident. F, approximate position of Misses F. and C. Du Cane.

Miss Louisa Du Cane, standing by the mantelpiece of her room, would have a direct view of anyone standing by the window of her mother's room, where the figure first appeared. Her sisters, standing at F, or thereabouts, would have a reflected view, and no direct view till the figure got nearly opposite the glass.

I saw the room in daylight, but was told that at night it was to some extent lighted ("like moonlight") by the street lamp opposite. Miss L. Du Cane saw the face better than the natural light would have enabled her to do. Her sisters, I gathered, saw the figure clearly but not the face. The dress, so far as seen, might have been that of, say, a purser on board a merchant steamer. The figure did not suggest to them any person they had ever seen, and its dress and appearance had no associations for them. Its arms were held away from the body, so that they saw the light between—about as a man's arms would be if his hands were in his pockets. They did not see the hands. I think it is doubtful how much of

detail each lady observed independently at the time, especially as they were a good deal startled and agitated, or how much the several impressions may have got defined and harmonised in recollection afterwards. The figure seems to have moved quietly towards them from the window.

There were no curtains, except a white muslin one, nor other objects making explanation by illusion plausible. It can hardly have been a real man, because a real man, having no business there, would not have come towards them. They believe, too, that they would have heard a real man going up or down the stairs, which were at the time uncarpeted, they having only recently come to the house. Moreover, had he gone downstairs he would have been met by Mrs. Du Cane, who came up from the drawing-room at once on hearing her daughters call out. There was no man living in the house.

It seems to me to have been a genuine and interesting case of collective visual hallucination, but a case where the circumstances admit of the hypothesis that the words or gestures of the first percipient may have produced the hallucination in the others by "suggestion." We have, however, no direct evidence of their being "suggestible" in this way, and subsequent attempts to see the ghost—sitting in the room in the dark, etc.—produced no result.

Miss M. Du Cane, who did not see the figure, appears to have been deterred by alarm from looking in its direction.

In the following case (G. 239, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 135) the percipients were under the impression that the grotesque figure they saw, and one of them touched, vanished through the floor. It is, however, perhaps possible that the vanishing as well as the figure was in this case an illusion, and that the appearance was due to a combination of moonlight and a light-coloured cat aided by imagination. The cat is suggested by the green eyes and the tactile impression, and the noiselessness of the moving figure is not inconsistent with the idea. At the same time we have no evidence whatever that there was such a cat about.

The account I give is that of one of the percipients, Miss McCaskill, and was enclosed in a letter dated July 25, 1892. We have also an account from the other percipient, and, further, one written in February, 1893, by Miss Alice Johnson immediately after talking over the experience with Miss McCaskill, and confirmed by the latter. These I do not reproduce; they will be found in the *Journal*. The three accounts are in very fair, though not absolutely complete, agreement.

(G. 239.)

4, SHAKESPEARE-ROAD, BEDFORD.

Last summer [August, 1891] I was paying a visit to some cousins, who were *en pension* with a German family, at Cassel. My cousin L. V. [assumed initials] and I shared a room, known, from the stained window, as the 'Ritterzimmer.' Our beds occupied almost all one side of the room, of which I send a rough plan [not reproduced]. One night we were late going to bed, and were not in bed till after 11.30. We went on talking for some time. We were neither of us the least nervous, nor was our conversation such as to make us so. I remember we were talking about the opera *Robert der Teufel*, to which we were going next day. We had stopped talking for a few minutes, and I was lying with my face to the wall, when I was startled by a scream from my cousin, and, turning round, saw a tall white figure standing in the room, near L.'s bed. I did not at the time feel frightened; my one idea was to find out what strange thing it was. It turned and came towards my bed, and I distinctly remember noticing that it made no sound on the polished wood floor. Its eyes were green and glistening, but the rest of the face seemed muffled up. As soon as it was close to my bed, I seized it, and seemed to take hold of something soft, like flimsy drapery, but whatever it was seemed dragged from me by some invisible power, and the thing literally sank into the floor by my bedside. L. was in a perfect terror, and her mother, and G. von T., and another friend were startled by the noise, and came to see what was the matter. We searched every-

where, but nothing was to be seen. I cannot account for not feeling afraid of it, especially as afterwards I heartily wished the night were over. L. knew there was a legend about our room, and that this apparition was said to come that day once in ten years, but she did not believe in it, and I knew nothing at all of the story. The people who had lived in the house before told Frau von T. that they had seen something twice in that room. They had lived there over 20 years; but Frau von T. had not been there long enough to test it before. No one could possibly have got into the room, as the door was a very noisy one, close to the foot of my bed. We slept in the room for some time, both before and after, but never saw anything more. As my cousin and I *both* saw the "thing," I am at a loss to account for it, but I should be extremely sorry to sleep in that room that day ten years.

AGNES McCASKILL.

In another unrecognised but vanishing case (G. 230, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 22) the light was somewhat better apparently than in those so far described, but the apparition was seen out of doors and at a somewhat greater distance. Mr. Reginald Barber writes :

(G. 230.)

24, LORNE-GROVE, FALLOWFIELD, MANCHESTER,
January 21st, 1891.

In April of last year, while the light was still good, I was returning home from a walk with my wife, and when within a few yards of the gate, which opens into a straight path leading to the house, both my wife and I saw a woman pass through the open gate and walk straight to the house, when, on reaching the door, she disappeared. I ran to the door, opened it with my latchkey, and expected in my astonishment to find her inside, for she seemed to have walked through the door. It all seemed so real that I at once searched the house, but in vain. We were the only two people in the street, and did not see the figure until she entered the gate, when we simultaneously exclaimed, "Who is that?" She seemed to come out of space and go into space again in a most

marvellous manner. She wore a plaid shawl, and her bonnet was a grey-black with a bit of colour in it. We could not remember hearing any sound as she walked, but otherwise we have never seen anything more apparently substantial. It is impossible for us to conceive how she could have disappeared if she had been of flesh and blood.

If only one of us had seen this figure, I should have thought little about it, as such cases of hallucination seem sufficiently common, and may be accounted for by some physical or mental disturbance; but the evidence in this case points to the existence of something exterior to ourselves.

We are neither of us believers in ghosts or the like, but are two ordinary matter-of-fact people.

REGINALD BARBER.

In answer to inquiries, Mr. Barber wrote as follows:

DEAR SIR,—I received your letter this morning, and [will] now . . . reply to your inquiries. "Did I or my wife see the figure first?" My wife points out that I must have seen the figure first, for she did not see it until it was well inside the gate. "Was there any expectation of a visit?" Not the least. "Give the distance of the apparition when it disappeared." A few yards, I could not say exactly. When I have heard Mrs. Barber telling friends of our experience, I have noticed that the figure presented to her mind does not seem to have been exactly the same as that which was evident to my mind. That would appear to support your theory that no real figure existed. Again, Mrs. Barber is sure she spoke first (though I thought we spoke at once), and, as she points out, I *saw* the figure first. This shows that the figure was not suggested by one to the other in any ordinary manner.

Mrs. Barber, I trust, will send you an account of our experience while I am from home.

I shall be glad to answer any further questions if you think the case calls for them.

REGINALD BARBER.

Mrs. Barber writes :

24, LORNE-GROVE, FALLOWFIELD, *January 30th*, 1891.

I shall be much pleased to give you my account of "our ghost."

I may begin by saying that Lorne-grove is a very quiet thoroughfare of no great length. During April last year the road was being paved, and consequently in a very chaotic state—full of loose stones, etc. The pavement on the opposite side to our house was already laid, so on returning from our walk on the 19th of that month my husband and I kept on that side of the road until we were exactly opposite our own gate. Up to this time we had seen no one in the Grove.

My husband now began to cross the road, bidding me follow, and take care not to fall on the loose stones. I did so, naturally looking down at my feet, until a little more than half way across the road, or about 6 yards from the gate, when on raising my eyes I saw a grey figure walking up the path to the door. She was then about a yard inside the gate, and although she had appeared so mysteriously, I felt no surprise, she looked so thoroughly commonplace and substantial. My husband saw her *enter* the gate, so there can be no question as to which of us *saw* her first, but I was certainly the first to exclaim: "Who is that?" although my husband's exclamation followed so quickly that they might almost be considered simultaneous, as indeed I believe Mr. Barber described them in his letter to you. I next said: "Stop a moment and let us see who it is," but he answered, "No, it is no good letting her ring," and hurried forward with his latchkey. The distance from the gate to the door is $7\frac{1}{2}$ yards, and when I first saw the figure I should be about 6 yards from the gate.

My husband would be at least a couple of yards in front of me, and as he saw the figure actually turn in at the gate he had a better view of her shawl and bonnet. I only saw that she was in grey, and that it was no one we knew. She walked quietly up the path and then up the two steps to the door, and I always fancy I saw

her raise her hand as though to ring the bell, but of that I cannot be sure, and then against the dark door she vanished completely, certainly not more than 4 yards from where my husband was standing. We were expecting no visitor, and our thoughts were far away from the supernatural, for just before crossing the road we had been saying how hungry we were, and how we should enjoy our supper.

I took special note of the date and hour, fully expecting we should hear of some occurrence which nearly concerned us, but nothing has, so far, transpired.

GERTRUDE BARBER.

Mr. Barber wrote later :

24, LORNE-GROVE, FALLOWFIELD, MANCHESTER,
February 6th, 1891.

Mrs. Barber thinks the time we saw the apparition would be as nearly as possible seven o'clock; I merely remember it was about sunset. I am sure it was light enough to see to read outside, and within there was no artificial light burning. I remember searching the house by daylight to find the figure we had seen. It was a beautiful, clear, calm evening. We do not know that we have seen anything hallucinatory before or since. If we saw a figure pass by in the street like the one we have described, its naturalness would cause us to make no observation. Mrs. Barber says she has often thought she has seen a cat, though perhaps not with the distinctness of nature. Suddenly seeing an object resembling a cat might, of course, provoke the illusion.

Mr. Barber says that he has sometimes experienced an auditory hallucination—namely, fancying that his wife was calling him by name from another room so distinctly that he rose to answer it, but as he reached the door fancied he heard her calling him back again. He has heard her call him in this way three times, but has had no other visual experience besides the one described above.

Mr. Myers called on Mr. Barber on August 1st, 1891, and gives the following account of his interview :

August 2nd, 1891.

I saw Mr. and Mrs. Barber yesterday, and inspected the scene of the apparition. It is quite clear that there was no real person on the step. When Mr. and Mrs. Barber turned into the street, a very short and quiet one, no one was visible. The figure appeared suddenly, entering the gate through which you pass over a few yards of flagged walk and up two steps to reach the front door.

The figure struck Mr. Barber at the time as noiseless. It is not certain that the figure looked the same to Mr. and Mrs. Barber. Mr. Barber, who was in front and saw it best, noticed a check in the shawl. Mrs. Barber did not look carefully at the dress, but took it to be grey. Both thought the woman a beggar, or something of that kind.

Mr. and Mrs. Barber have been about seven years in the house. No servant has died there, nor did the figure resemble the previous occupant.

Neither of them has ever had any other similar experience.

F. W. H. MYERS.

There is one more unrecognised and vanishing case (L. 827, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 71), and in it, it was the vanishing which startled the percipients and first made them think it was not a real man that they were looking at. Certainly its vanishing for both of them apparently at the same time and at different distances is difficult to reconcile with the hypothesis either of some optical illusion or of mistaken identity. On the other hand, a hallucination which persists for twenty minutes and "throws a good line" would be a very unusual one. The case is one where one specially regrets that the interval between experience and record was so long as four years, and wonders whether any error of memory seriously affecting the interpretation has crept in.

Mr. J. H. Wilkie Ridley, M.R.C.S. Eng., writes on October 12, 1885 :

(L. 827.)

About the middle of September, 1881, between five and six in the evening, whilst it was quite light, the Rev.

J. Jones, vicar of Dunston, and myself were fishing the North Tyne, at the junction of Blindburn with the Tyne, from a bank of shingle, in length about 80 yards and about 10 wide, sloping from a grass field to the margin of the river, with neither trees nor bush in the immediate vicinity, and after fishing for a short time Mr. Jones came up to me to ask for a match for the purpose of lighting his pipe. As we were thus standing together lighting our pipes from the same match, I said to him, "Do you see that man fishing down there?" He replied, "I have had my eye upon him for the last 20 minutes, and as it may be Major-General Allgood, I think I had better go down and apologise to him for the liberty we are taking, as I have not yet been once to see him this year to ask his permission to fish."

Accordingly Mr. Jones left me for this purpose, and when he came within 15 or 20 yards of the supposed fisher, the figure suddenly disappeared and seemed to pass away into nothing, whilst we were both looking on. Mr. Jones then turned round and looked towards me, but did not speak until I advanced to within a few paces of him, when he said, "Ridley, I hope nothing has happened at home." We at once proceeded to take down our rods.

Any one visiting the spot would at once see that no human being would be able to get away without being seen by us. Let me now describe the figure, as it appeared to us. It was dressed with felt hat, dark pilot jacket, light drab fishing stockings, laced boots. We never saw the face. The rod was a full-sized salmon rod, painted black, large brass reel. He was throwing from over the right shoulder. Mr. Jones remarked that he was throwing a good line. I might add that we left a Mr. Bartlett at our lodgings that evening before going out to fish, and it would appear that during our absence he had fallen asleep, as he informed us on our return. When questioned what he had been doing, he (to the best of my recollection) replied he had been sleeping.

JOHN JONES (Vicar of Dunston, Durham).

J. H. WILKIE RIDLEY, M.R.C.S. Eng.,

6, Collingwood Terrace, Gateshead.

[In an earlier, but second-hand account of the incident sent by Mr. Hartig of Gateshead, it was stated that the dress and rod of the figure seen resembled those of Mr. Bartlett, who had been fishing with the percipients earlier in the day.]

§ 3. *Collective Visual Hallucinations recognised.*

In the collective visual cases that remain to be described the apparition was recognised. In the first two it also vanished for at least one percipient. In the first (G. 275, *Journal*, Vol. XI., p. 185) the recognised apparition was that of a dead person. We received it through the Rev. A. Holborn, who knew both the percipients. The account, dated Dec. 9, 1903, printed below was written by one of them and signed by both. Their names and the address of the narrator were given fully, but with a request that they should not be printed. The second percipient preferred not to write an independent account.

(G. 275.)

The account runs :

A little friend of ours, H. G., had been ill a long time. His mother, who was my greatest friend, had nursed her boy with infinite care, and during her short last illness was full of solicitude for him.

After her death he seemed to become stronger for a time, but again grew very ill, and needed the most constant care, his eldest sister watching over him as the mother had done. As I was on the most intimate terms with the family, I saw a great deal of the invalid.

On Sunday evening, June 28th, 1903, about 9 o'clock, I and the sister were standing at the foot of the bed, watching the sick one, who was unconscious, when suddenly I saw the mother distinctly. She was in her ordinary dress as when with us, nothing supernatural in her appearance. She was bending over her boy with a look of infinite love and longing and did not seem to notice us. After a minute or two she quietly and suddenly *was not there*. I was so struck that I turned to speak to the

sister, but she seemed so engrossed that I did not think it wise to say anything.

The little patient grew gradually worse, until on Tuesday evening, June 30th, I was summoned to go at once. When I arrived at the house he had passed away. After rendering the last offices of love to the dear little body, the sister and I again stood, as on the Sunday, when I said, "M——, I had a strange experience on Sunday evening here." She quickly replied, "Yes, mother was here; I saw her." The young girl is not given to fancies at all, and must have been impressed as I was.

The next case (L. 1169, *Journal*, Vol. XIII., p. 210) came to us through the American Branch, from a member of it of some years' standing. Mr. E. (one of the percipients) and Mr. R. (whose apparition was seen) had worked in the same office with him for a number of years. After telling us a little about them in a letter dated December 7, 1900, he goes on :

(L. 1169.)

Mr. R. told me of his appearance to Mr. and Mrs. E. the morning after the occurrence, having heard it from Mr. E. At that time Mr. and Mrs. E. were averse to giving me any statement, and I have only recently overcome their scruples. I can add that the story has not grown any since it was first told me.—Sincerely yours, L. T.

Mr. E. writes :

Dec. 6th, 1900.

About two years ago, one Sunday afternoon, I was sitting with my wife in the back parlour of the flat we then occupied. At that time Mr. T. R. often spent his Sunday afternoons with us. We had spoken of him on this occasion, and of the probability of his calling, but were not specially expecting him or thinking of him. Happening suddenly to look up I saw Mr. R. standing in the front parlour, just within the door leading to the passage. I wondered how he had got in without ringing

and without being heard, but the image was so lifelike that I did not for an instant suspect a hallucination, and exclaiming "There is T. now," I arose and went to meet him. The figure persisted until I almost reached it and then instantly vanished. At my exclamation my wife also looked and distinctly saw and recognised the figure and also saw its sudden disappearance. Mrs. E. signs this statement in confirmation, and in case of publication we request that our names be withheld.

S. P. E.

J. E. E.

Mr. E. told me the foregoing circumstance the day after its occurrence, while the events of the evening were fresh in my mind. I can therefore say positively that I was asleep at the time of the occurrence, and have no recollection of dreaming of Mr. or Mrs. E. I have been seen "in the double" on other occasions, but I cannot put them on an evidential basis.

T. R.

There can be no doubt, I think, that the experience in this case was a collective hallucination, but it and the two I shall next quote are those in the collection which are most open to the suspicion that the experience of the second percipient was due to verbal suggestion, because the exclamation of the first was just what might have produced the appearance seen if verbal suggestion could do so. In the next two, moreover, the certainty is not so great as in the one just quoted that it was a case of hallucination. The characteristics by which the figure was recognised were, however, in both cases well marked and the light was good, and what was seen was certainly not the person or animal it was taken for. Mistaken identity seems therefore the only possible alternative to hallucination, and in both cases it is not an easy one to accept. In the first (G. 286, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 249) the apparition, if it was one, was of a cat. The case was sent to us on March 4th, 1912, by an Associate of the Society, to whom the principal witnesses are personally known. The names and addresses of all those concerned have been given to us, but since allusion is made below to matters

of private family history, pseudonyms are used here. It will be observed that the case was recorded within a week of its occurrence.

(G. 286.)

July 12th, 1909.

My sister, H. L. "Green," had a very favourite cat called Smoky, a pure-bred blue Persian of peculiar shade and small. There was no other cat in the village in the least like her. This spring she became ill, and died about the middle of June, 1909. The gardener buried her, and planted a dahlia over her grave. Shortly before Smoky died she had been worried by a dog, and had her ribs broken, so that she walked quite lame. This injury was the final cause of her death.

On Tuesday, July 6th, 1909, my sister and I were at breakfast, and I was reading a letter aloud to her. I was sitting with my back to the window, which was on my sister's left. Suddenly I saw her looking absolutely scared, and gazing out of the window. I said, "What is the matter?" and she said, "There's *Smoky*, walking across the grass!" We both rushed to the window, and saw Smoky, looking very ill, her coat rough and staring, and walking lamely across the grass in front of the window, three or four yards from it. My sister called her, and as she took no notice, she ran out after her, calling her. I remained at the window, and saw the cat turn down a path leading to the end of the garden. My sister ran after her, calling her, but to her surprise, Smoky did not turn nor take any notice, and she lost sight of her among the shrubs. About ten minutes afterwards, my sister and a friend living with us saw Smoky again, going through a hedge in front of the window. My sister again went out after her, but could not find her. She was next seen about half-an-hour afterwards by the servant, in the kitchen passage. She ran to get her some milk and followed her with it, but the cat walked away, and from that moment she disappeared completely. We made every enquiry of the neighbours, but no one had seen her, or any cat like her.

Of course we thought there had been some mistake about her death, though our friend, the gardener, and the boy had all seen her dead. The gardener was so indignant at the supposition that he had not buried the cat, that he went to the grave, took up the plant, and dug up the body of Smoky.

We are quite mystified at the occurrence, which was witnessed by four people, namely B. J. Green, H. L. Green, Miss Smith, and Kathleen B. (servant). When last seen the cat was walking towards — House, next door, where she had lived all the winter and spring. But when my sister went over there, the people at — House had seen nothing of her. When my sister *first* ran out after her, the cat *ran* away in front of her, moving fast, but on one side, as she did before she died.

B. J. [GREEN].

The account is also signed by Miss H. L. Green and Miss D. W. Smith. Miss B. J. Green says in a letter: "We did not ask the little maid to sign it, as we did not wish her to dwell on the occurrence."

The peculiar appearance of the cat and the nature of the surroundings in which it was seen make it improbable that in a small country place a real animal could have escaped all previous and subsequent observation. In reply to our enquiries Miss Green writes:

March 9th, 1912.

Our garden is a fairly large one; over half an acre, and is entirely surrounded by a wall. The high road runs on two sides of it, and on the other sides are our own house and two houses with gardens, both belonging to relations. Neither of these houses had any cat in the least like ours, nor had the people seen one in their gardens. There is a "spinney" about 100 yards up the road, but none nearer, and each time the cat was seen it was going in the opposite direction to this wood—once towards the end of our own garden, where it seemed to go into a beech hedge which screens the stable, etc. (My sister examined all this part, but could see nothing.) The last time, it was going towards the wall separating

our garden from that of — House (my cousin's house, in which my sister had lived for nine months while the owners were away; they had lately returned to it). It did not jump upon the wall, but seemed to disappear as it got near it. A tree on the other side of the wall shades this part of the garden. . . .

When I saw it, I was at a large window, which reaches within half a foot of the floor. Outside is a verandah, with glass tiles, about two yards in width; beyond this a grass-plot with flower-beds. When my sister and I saw the cat, she was on the grass, just beyond the verandah, in full sight from the window. I stood at the window, while my sister ran out after her, and I saw the cat walk slowly across the grass towards a path which bounds the grass-plot. My sister says she *ran* down this path, but I could not see this, as a holly-hedge hid the path from me.

I may add that I have never in my life seen anything supernormal, nor had our friend, Miss Smith; but my sister has twice seen curious "visions" or apparitions, though she is the most practical, "common-sense," person imaginable. Our father was Scotch (Galloway), our mother English.

I have wondered sometimes whether my sister's sight of the cat could have been conveyed to the other per-
cipients telepathically, so that they saw what was present to her vision.

The interest of the case seems to make it worth giving a further account of her sister's visions which Miss B. J. Green was kind enough to send.

March 13th, 1912.

In reply to your enquiry about my sister's experiences, I will write down (from her dictation) exactly what they were.

As a young girl of eighteen to twenty she spent two or three years with cousins at C—. [The] house was supposed to be haunted by an old lady, but nothing was said to my sister about this, and it was only after her experience that she was told of the supposed haunting.

My sister was in the habit of sitting up late in her room, studying or reading. One night when she was doing so, she heard, as she thought, her cousin coming along the passage to her door, which was open. She hastily blew out her light and kept quiet, fully expecting a scolding! But the steps returned down the passage again. Next morning she said laughingly to her cousin, "You nearly caught me last night; I suppose you saw me blow out my light." Her cousin said, "I never came down your passage at all"; but made no further remark, and my sister supposed it must have been a servant, but, feeling a little nervous, she took care to go to bed in good time. Some time afterwards she woke up with the feeling of a "presence" in the room, and, looking up, saw a figure bending over her. She was really alarmed, and hid her face in the bed-clothes. When she looked up the figure was gone. This time my sister was both alarmed and angry, and at breakfast next morning she told the story, and said she was going to question the nurse and other servants about it. Then our cousin begged her not to do so, and told her that the house was said to be haunted, and that queer things had often been heard there. After this my sister locked her door; but she was a very sensible, non-imaginative girl, and she heard nothing further of the "ghost." At the end of two or three years she came home, and did not visit C—— again for several years. Then she stayed in the same house, but on the lower floor, and though she remembered the story, and half expected to see the old lady, she saw and heard nothing whatever.

The third time she stayed there she had a very curious experience. This was two years later. She slept on the upper floor, but in a different room, and as she had seen nothing on her last visit, she expected no apparition at all. One night she woke up quite suddenly. She looked up, and there, over her shoulder, against the wall, was a man's head—the head only. It was quite clearly seen, as if it were lighted in some way, though the room was dark. It was a young face, with short beard, and very sad eyes, as if they had tears in them. She was so

startled that she called out "Go away, go away!" and hid her face for a moment. When she looked up the face was gone.

She has always said, since, that she is very sorry she was not brave enough to speak to the apparition.

Her next (and last) experience was, I think, the most curious of all.

She went, a year or two later, to stay with a married half-sister near B—— who was in very great trouble and in some personal danger. After staying with her about a month my sister was anxious to come home, and had almost decided to do so. Early one morning (it was getting quite light enough to see plainly) she woke up with the same sensation of a "presence," and saw kneeling by her bedside, with eyes fixed on her with an entreating expression and hands clasped, a woman's figure. She recognised the likeness in the face, partly to a picture of my half-sister's own mother (which hung in another half-sister's house), and partly to my eldest half-sister (not the one she was staying with). She felt quite certain, in a sort of flash, she says, that it was my half-sister's own mother who was there, and asking her to remain with her daughter. The figure disappeared almost directly (my sister thinks she started up, or put her hands up, she is not quite sure which), and it just went. But she took it as a real request, and stayed on as long as she was needed. (The reason she thought of leaving was because her presence did not seem to benefit my half-sister as she had hoped.)

These are all the things she has seen. But please do not imagine that she is hysterical or nervous. She is a trained nurse, very accurate, and particularly calm and quiet in manner. She is the only one of our family who has "seen anything" (except for my share in "Smoky's" apparition), and I think any one who knew her would say that she was a most unlikely "ghost seer." But she is a person of strong will and has much influence over others, and it was this quality which made me think that my vision of "Smoky" might have been telepathic from hers.

My father's first wife died more than two years before he married again, and about six years before my sister was born.

B. J. [GREEN].

I have read over this account and can vouch for its accuracy.

HELEN L. [GREEN].

In a subsequent letter Miss B. J. Green writes :

March 29th, 1912.

There is one more observation I should like to make re the "Smoky" story. My sister is not sentimental about animals, and though very sorry for the cause of Smoky's death, she was rather relieved when the suffering was ended, as she knew the cat could not recover from her injuries. She had certainly not fretted over her death. I note this lest any one reading the account should imagine that my sister was in any hysterical grief over the cat's death.

Miss H. L. Green's earlier experiences, whether subjective in origin or not, add to the probability that her vision of the cat was hallucinatory, since they show that she is subject to vivid visual hallucinations. It should be noted that she was the first person to see the "apparition" of the cat. The three subsequent percipients all knew, when they saw the cat, that it had been seen by her. The same explanation does not necessarily apply to each of the three appearances of the cat. The hypothesis that what was seen was a real cat mistaken for Smoky is most plausible in regard to the servant and least plausible in regard to the Misses Green; inversely, the evidence for collective hallucination and suggestion is in their case strongest. It is difficult to think that two persons, having good normal eyesight, could be completely mistaken as to the identity of an animal presenting several marked peculiarities, with which they were perfectly familiar and which they had on this occasion an excellent opportunity of observing. On the other hand it may well be that Miss H. L. Green, having experienced, as on previous occasions, a vivid subjective hallucination, was able to convey it to her sister. The case

gains much in value from the fact that those concerned are thoroughly competent observers, as may be judged from their reports.

It is worth while comparing this case with another collective apparition of a cat published in the "Report of the Census of Hallucinations," *Proceedings*, Vol. X., p. 305, and also in Podmore's book. It was collected for us by Dr. F. C. S. Schiller. In that case a white cat was seen by two ladies together on two different occasions, and each time it vanished before their eyes. The account was not, however, written till about five and six years respectively after the occurrences.

The next case (L. 959, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 131), obtained through the kindness of Mrs. Shield, relates to apparitions of the Rev. H. Hasted of Pitsea Rectory, Essex, which were seen by several different percipients, in two instances collectively. The first account is given by two of Mr. Hasted's servants.

(L. 959.)

PITSEA RECTORY,

March 17th, 10.40 a.m. [1892].

Yesterday, at half-past eleven, N., the rat-catcher came to see master, who was out. We looked at the clock to tell N. when we thought he could see master, who had ordered luncheon at 12.15. We were both outside the door when N. came. He was in a cart and had with him two dogs. He drove on, and Mrs. Watts, looking down the road, said, "Here comes the master!" Then I saw him too, his dog with him. N. had just got below the front gate. We watched to see them meet; wondered why N. did not stop to speak, as he wanted to see master. He drove right on. About that time we lost master; couldn't think where he was, but fancied he must have gone to Wilson's house. Wilson himself was standing lower down, where the roads meet. We still watched, and when we couldn't see him (master) come out we went indoors.

When Mr. Hasted came home I wasn't going to say anything, but Mrs. Watts asked if he had seen N., who wanted to tell him about a puppy. He said he had been at Mr. Williams's, and all the story came out.

ELIZA SMALLBONE.

JANE WATTS.

Mrs. Shield writes :

March 16th, 10 p.m.

This forenoon for upwards of an hour, Mr. Hasted was here [at Mr. Williams's] and I think it was from eleven to past twelve. He was writing and conversing. . . . Of all people in the world one would think these old servants are the very least likely to make a mistake, and the road is straight and not long, nor is it much frequented.

After making inquiries the next day, Mrs. Shield wrote further :

Mrs. Watts, the cook-housekeeper, was not at home.

. . .

Eliza thought it quite impossible they could make a mistake as to the person they saw, and everyone here says the same. No one would expect to see him without his dog, but, in fact, the dog was here with him.

I omit the accounts of Mr. Hasted's other appearances, as one is remote and the other at second hand, and will only remark that there are cases of different percipients having at different times hallucinations representing the same person, see *Phantasms of the Living*, Chap. XIV., § 5, and *Human Personality*, Vol. I., pp. 263 and 4. I myself visited sites of these appearances of Mr. Hasted and saw the witnesses of two of them. I wrote :

April 4th, 1892.

I have to-day seen Mr. Hasted and the site of three of his appearances, as well as Miss Florence Williams, who was one of the percipients on the first occasion, and Mr. Hasted's two servants who were the percipients on the last occasion—last month.

The appearance to Miss — does not appear to me to come to very much, on account of distance and shrubs, which must have obstructed the view not a little. Miss — is said, however, to have recognised the horse—a light-coloured one, unlike any others in the neighbourhood.

The appearance to the servants, though out-of-doors and at a considerable distance, is certainly remarkable. They stood at the back door of the house, looking down the lane after the rat-catcher. The lane is perfectly straight and open, and, say, 100 yards long or 150, to where it joins another road at right angles. At the end of this lane the cook saw Mr. Hasted and his dog coming towards the house, and almost before she called her fellow-servant's attention to him the latter saw him too. They saw him pass the groom's (Wilson's) cottage, which is near the end of the lane, and anticipated his meeting the rat-catcher and the latter stopping to speak to him. The rat-catcher's cart presently hid him from view, and when he should have appeared on their side of the cart he was gone. They were surprised, but supposed he must have turned and gone into Wilson's cottage, and thought no more of it. Wilson, however (whom I also saw), was standing all the time at the end of the lane, and he is quite positive that there was no one whatever in the lane at the time except the rat-catcher. Mr. Hasted's peculiar way of walking and swinging his stick was noticed. His dog is a brown and white spaniel, and there is no other like it in the neighbourhood except one kept tied up. The servants say they noticed this dog and the rat-catcher's two dogs all at the same time. They struck me as good witnesses. It is certain that it could not have been Mr. Hasted himself because the servants had noticed the time just before (11.35) in order to tell the rat-catcher when they thought their master would be in, and at that time Mr. Hasted was with Miss F. Williams and Mrs. Shield at Bowers Gifford, and they also noted the time. Mr. Hasted was hurrying through some work, wondering whether he should get it done in time to go home for lunch at 12.15.

When Miss F. Williams and her sister (as children) saw him, he was also coming along a straight road, the approach to the Rectory, towards them. They watched him through some bushes as he approached. When he got up to the garden gate, they withdrew more behind the bushes that he might not see them, but neither he nor anyone else passed. The way to the back door leads off from the garden gate, and it seems just possible that the person they saw was not Mr. Hasted and was someone who went to the back door. Their recognition of Mr. Hasted was, however, very distinct. They do not remember hearing any steps going towards the back door; they believe that they asked, and found that no one had gone there. It was a good many years ago.

Mr. Hasted was also, we were told, supposed to have been seen on the beach at Bournemouth by a lady friend lately, when he was not at Bournemouth at all.

In the next case (L. 828, *Journal*, Vol. IV., p. 72) the hallucination, if it was one, was very unusual in character, and though mistaken identity is also a hypothesis difficult to maintain, I think it is the easier of the two. Mr. Maddison writes from Sunderland, Feb. 6th, 1888 :

(L. 828.)

On the night of December 3rd, 1887 (Saturday), I was serving customers in the bar, together with my daughter. About a quarter past nine (as near as I can remember) I saw William Frazer standing at the private door of the bar that leads into the house. He said, "Well, how are you, old man?" I replied, "Hallo! is that you, Frazer—long looked for, come at last." My daughter, who was standing near me, behind the counter, turned round and saw him also, for she called out, "Good gracious! Wonders never cease." I had a tray of glasses in my hand at the time which I was just about to carry upstairs, so I came to the door beside Frazer, took him along to the smoke-room, and saw him enter. As he stood just within the room, with his back almost turned to me, I said, "Content yourself there. I'll be down in a minute."

While saying this I remember distinctly I stood with my foot on the bottom step of the stair. I also remember that as I passed the smoke-room door I saw a stranger seated in an armchair near the fire. I took the glasses upstairs, and returned in about a minute and a-half; but on entering the smoke-room I found neither Frazer nor the stranger there. I thought Frazer must be hiding somewhere, as he was always full of fun and "up to larks," so I searched all over the house for him, also over the yard and outhouses, as I thought he might have slipped out there while I was upstairs. I concluded he must have gone home, and would doubtless return the next day (Sunday) to settle up. I should explain that the "Engineers' Friendly Society" meets at my house. Frazer is a member, and before going on his last voyage he had asked me to keep his subscriptions paid up while he was away. This I had done, so that when I saw him at the bar-door, I naturally concluded he had called to settle with me about his society's affairs. He did not call on the Sunday, and some days later we saw the *Collingwood* ss. (Frazer's vessel) reported in the newspapers as arriving at Antwerp. When Frazer appeared, he was dressed much as usual, with the exception of his hat. He carried a black leather bag. He looked tired and dejected, and he did not look me straight in the face.

On the night of December 19th (Monday) Frazer did actually call upon us. We told him of our strange experience. He told us that on the night of the 3rd the *Collingwood* ss. sailed from Gibraltar for Antwerp. He didn't say what he was doing at a quarter past nine—in fact, he laughed at the whole affair. They had had some very rough weather on the voyage, hence their detention. I settled up with him in connection with the Friendly Society, then we walked out together. He was not so lively as usual; he didn't feel much inclined to go to sea again at once—he thought he was entitled to "a bit holiday." He asked my advice about it; I didn't advise him either one way or the other, but left it to himself to decide. I regret now that I didn't advise him to remain ashore, for the next day he sailed

for Savona in the *Collingwood*, from the Tyne (owners, C. Tully and Co.). His vessel has not been heard of since leaving Gibraltar; she is now fully a month overdue. Frazer's mother has not given up hopes of his safety yet—but I have, so has the owner. The mother thinks the crew may have been picked up by some outward bound vessel.

Frazer was a fine young fellow, 25 years of age, unmarried, second engineer on board the *Collingwood* ss.

I have never had a similar experience to this before. My daughter and I are certain we were not mistaken in our man. We know no one else at all resembling Frazer.

GEORGE MADDISON.

Miss Maddison wrote an exactly concordant account two and a half months later, giving the remarks exchanged almost verbatim as her father did.

It will be admitted that it is very unusual for a hallucination to affect similarly both sight and hearing of two percipients—I do not think we have another instance of it—and to persist while one percipient “took him along to the smoke-room.” The testimony of the person in the smoke-room might have been conclusive on the question whether the figure seen was a real man or not, but Mr. Nisbet, at that time Honorary Associate of the Society, had an interview with Mr. and Miss Maddison, and ascertained that Mr. Maddison did not know who this person was.

§ 4. *Collective Auditory Cases.*

It is, generally speaking, more difficult in the case of purely auditory experiences than in the case of visual ones to feel sure that they are really hallucinatory, because we more often fail to interpret real sounds correctly than real sights. This is especially true of non-vocal noises. In the non-vocal cases, however, in our collection the sounds heard were regarded by the percipients as probably, or at least possibly, veridical, being associated with external events, and they already have been or will be dealt with under appropriate heads. The cases that remain consist of one

in which the sounds were musical—as of voices singing—and two in which names were called. But the musical one and one of the others seem to me very doubtfully hallucinatory, and I will only describe them briefly.

In L. 1203 (*Journal*, Vol. XVII., p. 118) we have the evidence of four members of a family who, in the ruins of the Abbey of Jumièges, heard for a few seconds sounds as of monks singing. Their efforts to discover any natural cause for this failed, but whether the possibilities were exhausted may perhaps be doubted.

In the next case (L. 960, *Journal*, Vol. VI., p. 139) the percipients were again out of doors, in a street. Mr. U. J. da Costa Cabral of Rio, together with a number of schoolboys, his pupils, heard and recognised the voice of his sister who lived with him. The voice called two names, his own “Ulysses” and that of his brother-in-law “Bittencourt.” His sister had not called and nothing had happened to her. The voice seemed to come from the corner of the street, but when some of the boys ran there, they found nothing. The case was sent by Professor Alexander of Rio, who examined the witnesses.

The third case (G. 247, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 9) is, I think, more remarkable. It was received through the Rev. W. S. Grignon. We are not permitted to print the names of the percipients.

(G. 247.)

One of them, Mr. W., writes :

August 6th, 1893.

On the 1st November, 1892, soon after 11 a.m., while seated with Mr. S——, in the office room of his house at ——, Poona, I distinctly heard a voice with which I was quite unacquainted call out in sharp clear tones, “Mrs. H——! Mrs. H——!” (my sister-in-law, who was lost in the *Roumania* a few days previously). The voice seemed to be that of someone calling from above to my sister-in-law down stairs.

My age was 36, and at the time I was in good health, though in grief and anxiety about the loss of my sister-in-law; [I] was discussing an official report of mine, which Mr. S——, who is the head of my Department, was reading out.

Mr. S—— distinctly heard the same voice, and we both started up and went outside into the verandah and all over the house, but there was no one about except the peons, who declared no one had called out. The ladies of the house were in one of the back bedrooms, but they had neither heard the voice, nor had they been calling out.

I have never had an experience of this kind before.

Mr. S. writes :

POONA, August 6th, 1893.

Mr. W——'s statement is absolutely true. I heard the voice, clear and distinct, call out, "Mrs. H——," twice. It was a voice not belonging to my household, and a strange voice,—the voice of a woman alarmed; and it sounded as if on board ship calling down a skylight. I say this in perfect faith, as I began life as a sailor, and served seven years in the Indian Navy, and have had personal experience of the peculiar sound of voices calling down hatchways and skylights on board ship at sea. The voice was so real, and the name so distinctly uttered, that Mr. W—— and I left the table at which we were seated and ran outside into the verandah of the bungalow in the endeavour, on the spur of the moment, and on natural impulse, to discover the owner of the voice; but there was no one at all near, within speaking or calling distance. Two peons, or native messengers, who were in the verandah, informed us that no European had been near, and these peons knew no English.

§ 5. *Semi-reciprocal and Reciprocal Cases.*

So far the simultaneous psychical experiences described in this chapter, whether dreams or hallucinations, have occurred to percipients who were together at the time. In

the cases that remain, the percipients were apart. There is therefore no longer any question of suggestion by word or gesture; if the two psychic experiences were connected, it almost must have been telepathically. There seems no other alternative.

In the first two, which are in some ways curiously alike, the percipients have simultaneous, but not similar, hallucinations of each other—*A* seeing an apparition of *B*, and *B* hearing *A* call.

The first (L. 1150, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 193) was obtained for us by a Member of the Society, Mr. A. W. Orr, of 15 Moorland Road, Didsbury, Manchester, who collected all the evidence available. It will be observed that the case was reported to us within a few weeks of its occurrence. Mr. Orr writes :

(L. 1150.)

July 26th, 1905.

I enclose an account of a hallucination experienced by Mrs. Ellen Green of Manchester during a recent visit to Cardiff, and of another in connection therewith experienced by a Captain Ward, a retired master mariner, which I have got the various persons concerned to sign as being correct.

Mrs. Green is a trance-speaker on spiritualistic platforms and is a natural clairvoyante, but not by any means a credulous person. . . .

The account enclosed was as follows :

I had been staying at the house of Mr. Ward, a retired Master in the Mercantile Marine, who resides at Northwood House, Llanishen, near Cardiff, and on Tuesday, June 20th [1905], he drove me over to Whitchurch (about two miles from Llanishen) where I was to spend a couple of days with friends, Mr. and Mrs. Berwick. He left me there at about eleven o'clock in the forenoon and returned to his home. On the following afternoon at about half-past three I was sitting alone in the drawing-room, Mrs. Berwick being in her own room, and, on happening to look up, I saw Mr. Ward standing at the bay window and looking in at me as though he desired to speak to me.

He was in his usual dress and is not a man to be easily mistaken for any one else. Thinking he had brought some letters for me, I rose hastily and went towards the window calling to him and waving my hand to him, partly in greeting and partly as a sign for him to go to the hall door, but when I reached the window I was surprised not to see him. I concluded, however, that he must have gone to the door without my noticing and so I hurried to the door to let him in. I was exceedingly surprised and alarmed when I opened the hall-door to see nobody there, nor anywhere about the house. Later when Mrs. Berwick came down I told her—and also Mr. Berwick—of my experience, and like myself they felt extremely anxious lest some harm had happened to Mr. Ward, for whom we all felt a strong regard.

Next morning, however, soon after eleven o'clock Mr. Ward arrived in his trap according to arrangement to take me to the railway station to join the train for Manchester. He was in a very weak state and suffering from severe injuries to his ankle, neck, and shoulders, and he remarked to us, "It is a wonder I have been able to come to you in the body." It seemed that whilst driving home on Tuesday the horse, which was a very nervous animal, upset the trap and caused him to be thrown out and badly bruised and shaken. The next afternoon, whilst lying on a couch in his sitting-room, he was wondering what Mrs. Green would think if she knew of the occurrence, when he suddenly heard her voice outside the house. There being only an elderly woman in the house he managed with great difficulty to get to the hall-door to admit Mrs. Green, and was greatly amazed not to see her. The time was between three o'clock and four, just about the time when Mrs. Green saw his form at Whitechurch.

We certify that this account of the hallucinations seen and heard by Mrs. Green and Captain Ward is correct.

ELLEN GREEN.

FREDERICK WARD.

JOHN BERWICK.

FANNY A. BERWICK.

In reply to enquiries about this case, Mr. Orr wrote :

July 28th, 1905.

In reply to your questions *re* Mrs. Green's experience in South Wales, I may say that when she told me the circumstances I asked her to repeat the account, and I took a shorthand note of it which I transcribed and sent to her to get the signatures of the other people affixed to it, so that I could send it then to you. For some reason Mr. Green re-wrote the narrative (copied, I believe, from my note) and his copy was sent [to] and signed by Mr. and Mrs. Berwick and Captain Ward; Mrs. Green handed it to me and I posted it to you.

I have written to the other persons asking them to let me have their individual statements, . . . I know nothing of them personally.

Mrs. Green is a trance speaker and is engaged for Sunday services all over the country . . . I have known her for some years and have the fullest confidence in her integrity . . . She has had many very remarkable experiences during her life, but, as is so frequently the case, no note was made of them at the time, and so they are lost for all practical purposes. . . .

Mr. Orr obtained later the following statements from the other witnesses in the case :

(1)

From Mr. J. Berwick.

10, WINDSOR TERRACE, PENARTH,
4th August, 1905.

. . . I am quite willing to do what is reasonably possible to confirm the statement made by Mrs. Green, but you have evidently overlooked the fact that the original document is an attested one and was signed while the incident was fresh in our memories; but to sit down now and write an accurate account of what was said and done last June is an impossible task for a very busy man. I really do not remember the details sufficiently clearly to make a statement which [could] be used for comparison

with one made two months ago, but you are quite at liberty to use our names in so far as they relate to the statement already in your possession. I am sorry I cannot do more.

JOHN BERWICK.

(2)

From Captain Ward.

NORTHWOOD, BIRCHGROVE, CARDIFF,
2nd August, 1905.

I have pleasure in reply to your letter to give you here the facts of the incident as it actually happened. On the 20th June last I drove Mrs. Green in my pony trap to Mr. Berwick's house in Whitchurch, Cardiff, and on returning home to above address, met with an accident, being thrown out of my trap backwards, hurting my neck and ankle. On the following day the 21st inst. I was unable to leave the house, and lay on the sofa in my dining room, when between the hours of 3 and 4 p.m. I distinctly heard Mrs. Green's voice outside the front door calling me. I managed to rise from the couch and look out through the window to call her in, but found no person there; the time would exactly agree with that when Mrs. Green saw my form at Whitchurch.

This I found out on speaking to Mrs. Green on Thursday the 22nd inst. I had not seen her between the 20th and 22nd. The above are the facts of the case.

FREDERICK WARD.

The second case (L. 1187, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 259) was communicated to us by Mr. W. W. Baggally. Both Miss Emma Steele and Mr. Claude Burgess, the lady and gentleman concerned in the case, are known personally to Mr. Baggally.

(L. 1187.)

Miss Steele writes as follows :

16 & 17, SILLWOOD PLACE,
BRIGHTON, March 13th, 1912.

Mr. Claude Burgess, who is an invalid, had been staying at my private hotel, at the above address, for some

months. He left on February 15th to take up his residence at No. 10, Belgrave Place, Kemp Town, Brighton. In the interval between the date of his leaving and the night of the 5th inst., when I had the remarkable dream (if it can be called a dream) which I am about to relate, I had not seen Mr. Burgess and nothing had occurred to cause me to think particularly about him.

On the above night I retired to rest at my usual time. I awoke finding myself standing in the middle of my room and answering, "All right, I'm coming," to Mr. Burgess, who, I thought, called three times: "Miss Steele! Miss Steele! Miss Steele!"

By the time I had put on my dressing gown and lighted the gas I was fully awake. I then remembered Mr. Burgess was no longer in the house. I looked at the clock and noticed it was exactly 3 a.m. When I came downstairs next morning, I told my cook my dream, and remarked I hoped nothing had happened to Mr. Burgess. During the next day, Wednesday, 6th March, in the afternoon, a man called while I was out and left a note from Mr. Burgess, which I enclose. I was much surprised by its contents. It struck me most forcibly getting it from him, as he is paralysed and has to write with great difficulty with his left hand. He very seldom writes now, so it must have made a great impression on him seeing me as he relates in his letter.

EMMA M. STEELE.

The letter from Mr. Burgess to Miss Steele referred to above, which is now in our possession, was as follows:

10, BELGRAVE PLACE, BRIGHTON.

MY DEAR EMMA,

I had a funny dream about you last night. I dreamed that you appeared at about 3 a.m. Just a glimpse of you. It's funny, isn't it?

Yours,

CLAUDE BURGESS.

Miss Steele's cook made the following statement to Mr. Baggally :

March 13th, 1912.

On Wednesday morning, the 6th March last, Miss Emma Steele came down from her bedroom at 8.30. I saw she was looking pale. I asked her if she were not well. She replied that she had had a strange dream. She heard Mr. Burgess call her three times. She told me that she suddenly jumped up and put her dressing gown on. By the time she had put on her dressing gown and lit the gas she remembered Mr. Burgess had left the house. She said it was about 3 o'clock a.m. when she heard Mr. Burgess call.

(Signed) SARAH POLLARD.

The following statement was written by Mr. Baggally on March 13th, 1912, from Mr. Claude Burgess's dictation :

On Tuesday night, 5th March, 1912, I woke up at about 3 a.m. with a start. I saw Miss Emma Steele standing at the door of my bedroom. I had closed the door, but she appeared to have opened it. She was attired in her ordinary dress.

I was much surprised. It was an absolutely distinct apparition. I had not been thinking of her the previous day and I cannot tell why she appeared to me.

The apparition lasted about five seconds. I was not at all frightened and went to sleep immediately after.

I was so struck by what I had seen that, next morning, the 6th March, at about 11 o'clock, I wrote a letter to Miss Steele which I handed to Mr. William Watkins, the proprietor of the establishment where I now reside, for him to send to Miss Steele. In this letter I told Miss Steele that I had dreamed that she had appeared to me on the previous night.

(Signed) CLAUDE BURGESS.

In reply to Mr. Baggally's personal enquiries, Mr. Claude Burgess stated that it was the first time that he had had a hallucination of this kind, and he had not had one since.

Statement by Mr. William Watkins.

10, BELGRAVE PLACE,
BRIGHTON, *March 13th*, 1912.

Mr. Claude Burgess delivered to me a letter which he had written to Miss Steele, at about 11 a.m. on March 6th, which I handed to a man of the Church Army Labour Home to take to Miss Steele. The same morning at 8 a.m. Mr. Burgess told me he had dreamt of Miss Steele.

WILLIAM WATKINS.

Statement by Mr. Baggally.

I called on the afternoon of the 13th March, 1912, at the offices of the Church Army Labour Home, St. James Street, Brighton, and saw the Secretary, who showed me an entry in their books confirming the fact that, at the request of Mr. William Watkins, a man in their employ had delivered a letter to Miss Emma Steele of 16, Sillwood Place, Brighton, in the afternoon of 6th March, 1912.

I have interviewed all the persons connected with this case and they confirmed their respective statements.

W. W. BAGGALLY.

In reply to our further questions as to whether Mr. Burgess's experience was a dream or a waking hallucination, Mr. Baggally wrote to us on April 1st, 1912:

I had an interview with Mr. Burgess to-day, and the following is the information I received from him respecting the points you raise. He said to me:

“(1) I used the word dream in my letter to Miss Steele for want of a better word. (2) I woke up and *then* had the vision of Miss Steele. (3) I did not notice anything in the room at the time I had the vision. The room appeared dark. (4) Miss Steele appeared to me in a bright light, not self-luminous or phosphorescent, but just as she would have appeared in daylight. She appeared to me in the part of the room where the door was.”

Mrs. Baggally sends us the following statement enclosed in a letter dated April 27th, 1912 :

I was in the drawing-room of Miss E. Steele's sister on the evening of Wednesday, March 6th, when Miss Emma Steele came in, saying in an excited manner, "Where is Mr. Baggally? He will be so interested in this."

She held in her hand a letter from Mr. Burgess, and proceeded to tell me that the previous night she had heard, as she thought, Mr. Burgess fall on the floor of the bedroom over her own. She sprang out of bed. Finding herself in the middle of the room she heard him call "Miss Steele" three times. She then suddenly remembered that Mr. Burgess was no longer living in her hotel. She struck a light, looked at the clock and found it was 3 o'clock. The following morning she felt so tired that when giving orders to her cook, the latter noticed her fatigue and commented upon it. She told the cook the reason was that she heard Mr. Burgess apparently calling her at 3 o'clock.

Miss Steele proceeded to say that Mr. Burgess had, curiously [enough], sent her that afternoon the note which at that moment she held in her hand and in which he told her that he dreamt she had appeared to him at 3 a.m. the previous night.

Miss Steele appeared much impressed and wondered if anything had happened to Mr. Burgess. I informed my husband that same night on his return home, [of] what Miss E. Steele had told me.

LAURA E. BAGGALLY.

On my return home on the evening of March 6th my wife related to me what appears in her statement above.

W. W. BAGGALLY.

In the first of these cases (Mrs. Green and Captain Ward) there can be little doubt that both experiences were waking hallucinations. In the second this is less certain, for both experiences occurred at the moment of waking. It seems pretty certain, however, that

Mr. Burgess was awake when he saw Miss Steele's phantasm, though in Miss Steele's case the hearing of the call seems more like the end of a dream, and it is not quite clear—probably was not clear to herself at the time—whether she awoke from it or to it. It is not a question of much importance, for in both cases the experiences were evidently of a markedly impressive character.

Neither of these cases was exactly reciprocal in the fullest sense, for there is no evidence of the percipients participating in each other's experiences, or realising each other's surroundings and circumstances or ideas in any way. I think it is very likely that there was reciprocal telepathic action and reaction—each party being both agent and percipient. But there is little or no internal evidence of this. The utmost that can be said, I think, is that Miss Steele's intention, before she was fully awake, to go to Mr. Burgess's assistance may have caused the appearance to him of her phantasm, and that Mrs. Green's call to the phantasmal Captain Ward may have been the cause of the hallucinatory call heard by him. But this is highly conjectural, as the details do not correspond; and if it was so, it would indicate one-sided rather than reciprocal influence. The evidence for telepathy depends, as it does in death-coincidences, on a phantasm of *A* being seen or heard by *B* at the time that an unusual event was occurring to *A*—that event being death in the case of a death coincidence, and the perception of a phantasm of *B* in the two cases we are discussing.

In the next case (L. 1122, *Journal*, Vol. IX., p. 331)—a case of two dreams dreamt in different rooms of the same house on the same night and probably at the same hour—the element of possible reciprocity is somewhat more marked; for in both dreams the husband was believed to be examining the supposed injury to the leg, and the half-awake thought that followed the dreams corresponded. Nevertheless the evidence scarcely carries us beyond thought-transference, not necessarily involving

reciprocal action, and this, it will be observed, is the view taken of it by the dreamer who sent it to us. He is an Associate of the Society who has long been actively interested in psychical research and was well known to Mr. Myers, as he is to other Members of the Council. In estimating the evidential value of the case, due weight must of course be given to the probability that the pre-occupation of the dreamers with the main subject of the dreams may have helped to produce them, at least in part. But this would not account for the correspondence in detail (as far as it goes) nor for the coincidence in time. Mr. —, who prefers that his name should not appear in connection with this case, writes :

(L. 1122.)

October 11th, 1900.

I beg to send you a small but rather definite experience of thought-transference, which has just occurred to us. I have collected a number of other people's cases, but never had one of my own till now.

The account enclosed is as follows :

Sunday, October 7th, 1900.

I woke abruptly in the small hours of this morning with a painful conviction upon me that my wife, who was that night sleeping in another part of the house, had burst a varicose vein in the calf of her leg, and that I could feel the swelled place, three inches long. I wondered whether I ought to get up and go down to her room on the first floor, and considered whether she would be able to come up to me ; but I was only partly awake though in acute distress. My mind had been suddenly roused, but my body was still under the lethargy of sleep. I argued with myself that there would sure to be nothing in it, that I should only disturb her, and so shortly went off to sleep again.

On going to her room this morning I said I had had a horrid dream, which had woke me up, to the effect that she had burst a varicose vein, of which just now care has

to be taken. "Why," she replied, "I had just the same experience. I woke up at 2.15 feeling sure the calf of my leg was bleeding, and my hand seemed to feel it wet when I put it there. I turned on the light in alarm, noticing the time, and wondered if I should be able to get up to thee, or whether I should have to wake the housekeeper. Thou was in the dream, out of which I woke, examining the place."

Though I did not note the hour, 2 o'clock is about the time I should have guessed it to be; and the impression on my mind was vivid and terrible, knowing how dangerous such an accident would be. It is the first certain case of thought-transference I have had. My wife's account is being written independently of this. I regard her as the agent, myself the percipient, and some pain in the leg the original source of the impression.

The other witness concerned in the case writes:

[On the] night of October 6th, 1900, I went to bed about 11.0; the veins of my left leg which are varicose were rather more painful than usual, and the whole calf felt and looked lumpy.

I felt twinges of pain in it off and on in my sleep without being entirely roused till about 2.15 a.m. Then, or just before, I dreamt or had a vivid impression that a vein had burst, and that my husband, who was sleeping in another room up another flight of stairs, was there and called my attention to it. I thought it felt wet and trickling down the leg as if bleeding, passed my hand down and at first thought it seemed wet, but on gaining fuller consciousness found all right, and that it was not more painful than often when I got out and stood on it. Thought over the contingency of its actually bursting and whether I could so bandage it in that case as to make it safe to go up to my husband's room, and thought I could do so.

Looking at my watch found it about 2.20.

Almost immediately on my husband's coming down, about 7.30 a.m., he told me that he had wakened early in the night (about same time would be early to him)

with an impression that the vein in my leg had burst and was bleeding; that he had wondered if he should come down and thought over whether I should be able to bandage it and go up to him, had decided I could. "It was just here," he said, pointing on his own left leg to the exact spot at the top of the calf where I have the most trouble.

In answer to a question as to the accuracy of Mrs. —'s recollection that he had at the time debated within himself whether she would be able to bandage her leg (a detail not mentioned in his own account), Mr. — writes :

October 22nd, 1900.

In response to your query, I certainly thought of my wife coming up with her leg bandaged. It was part of my idea of her difficulties.

In the next case (L. 1149, *Journal*, Vol. XII., p. 173) the percipients were again in two separate rooms of the same house. It is distinctly, at least to some extent, reciprocal—one sister being aware of the other's pain and of her answer to a question, and the other sister dreaming of the first sister's enquiry. The experiences of both sisters were odd and difficult to define, but probably those of Miss Isabelle Pagan occurred while she was really asleep, and thus were dreams though of an unusual kind; and that while the experience of Miss Elizabeth Pagan began as a dream, the dream figure of her sister persisted for a moment or two as a waking hallucination after the dreamer had waked herself by replying to the enquiry heard in the dream. It is a pity that an account of so interesting a case was not written down, like the two last, immediately after it occurred.

(L. 1149.)

The first account was written by Miss I. M. Pagan, of 24, Newbattle Terrace, Edinburgh.

May 8th, 1905.

On the night of Wednesday, 17th of March, 1904 (as nearly as I can remember the date), I was sleeping in my

own room at the top of this house, my sister Elizabeth being in the room next mine. In the middle of the night—at what hour I do not know—I was awakened by a curious sensation of pressure from above, as of a weight resting gently but firmly on me, and looking up saw my sister Elizabeth suspended in some way above me in the air. She was lying with her eyes shut, covered with a quilt as if in bed, and looked very pale and ill. I felt no surprise but only concern for her evident suffering, and a strong impulse to get up and minister to her. (She is subject to occasional attacks of severe pain, and I have nursed her through them very frequently.) However, as soon as I tried to rise I found myself too heavy with sleep to do so. My eyes would not open, and my shoulders seemed as if held down by their own weight. Yet I had felt quite wide awake and fully conscious of where I was, of the furniture in the room, etc. It seemed as if I gave up the attempt to rise, partly because she made me understand that she did not need my help, but only wanted to be near me. So I put out my arm—half sitting up, and without effort—and guided her to a place beside me on the bed, falling asleep again as soon as she was comfortably settled. She seemed to float through the air much as a child's india-rubber balloon would do, and was quite easily moved when I touched her. After a while I woke again with a start and a feeling of distress at my own laziness, and again made an effort to rise, thinking remorsefully that she had been in pain and I ought to have got up and made a poultice, but had done nothing for her. There was again a difficulty in rousing myself, and then came the recollection that she was beside me, so that I didn't need to rise. I sat up (once more with ease) and asked, "Are you all right now?" I heard her answer, "Yes, I am all right, thank you," and went to sleep again.

In the morning I was wakened by my youngest sister Hilda, who came into the room saying, "Betty sent me to tell you that you came to her in your astral body last night." "No I didn't!" I exclaimed, "she came to me. Was she in pain?" "Yes."

I went to my sister's room and found she *had* been suffering during the night, had thought of calling me, but decided she wasn't ill enough to need any treatment. After lying awake for about half-an-hour she fell asleep, and was awakened by my voice asking, "Are you all right now?" and looking up saw me near the door of her room—rather a shadowy figure enveloped in bed-clothes, even the head being partially covered. She answered, "Yes, I am all right, thank you," and went to sleep again with the impression that I had somehow ministered to her.

As a matter of fact I was lying much muffled up, as I had felt cold and drawn the clothes well up over my ears. I am perfectly certain I did *not* get out of bed all night, and I have never done anything in the sleep-walking line. This is my only "psychic experience" worth recording. I once previously had the same strong impression of a friend having come to me in the night, but have no corroborative evidence. . . . My attention was not directed to these subjects at the time, and I dismissed the incident as a curiously vivid dream; but though I dream a good deal, these two experiences stand out from other dreams as different. I feel that whatever the state of consciousness may have been, I was *awake* and alive to my physical surroundings in a way quite unusual in ordinary dreams.

A cousin (Mrs. Young) came to live with us on the 15th March, and recalls that it was *after* she arrived that the incident took place. I left home on the 22nd, so the "vision" came to me between these two dates, I believe on the 17th.

ISABELLE M. PAGAN.

E. H. C. PAGAN.

G. HILDA PAGAN.

In reply to enquiries and a request for separate statements from the two sisters, whose signatures were added to hers, Miss I. M. Pagan wrote:

June 20th, 1905.

. . . The sleep-walking theory would naturally suggest itself, but I do not think it is a possible explanation in

this case. You will note my sister's very *momentary* impression of my presence and how it faded away, and also the fact that it never for an instant occurred to her that it could be myself. Now the room she slept in is very small, 18 ft. 6 × 10 ft., and the bed was quite near the door—within 6 ft., and her hearing is exceptionally quick and her sight good (except that she wears glasses for *reading*). If I had really been there she would have heard me. On one or two occasions when I have felt poorly I have gone to her room to boil some water on her gas fire, and she always heard me the moment I entered and asked, "What is it?" I have never walked in my sleep nor have I heard of any grown-up member of our huge connection doing so. Various little children among dozens of cousins and nieces have got out of bed occasionally and wandered into their mother's room, or crossed the floor to the nurse's bed, etc., etc. One of my own sisters did so twice or thrice when she was about five. . . . Of course there *may* have been cases of older sleep-walking in the family; for my mother had 100 first cousins on one side of the house alone, and we have relatives by the score whom we scarcely know; but on the whole we are a healthy and normal set, and if there had been anything striking in that line I should probably have heard of it. I see in my sister's account she says she felt ill on going to bed. None of us had any idea of that. It never even struck me she looked poorly.

Miss Elizabeth Pagan writes :

24, NEWBATTLE TERRACE, EDINBURGH, *June 20th, 1905.*

My sister, Isabelle Pagan, tells me you wish to have a statement from me relating to the curious sort of dream she and I seemed to experience in common some months ago. My recollection of the incident is that while retiring for the night I felt far from well, but I did not mention the fact to any one lest one of my sisters should think of sitting up with me or at least staying awake on the chance of being wanted. Isabelle's room is next to mine and I knew I could summon her if necessary by knocking on the wall. After two or three somewhat painful hours

I fell asleep; and towards morning, though the room was still very dark, I woke, as if from a dream, hearing myself say, "I am all right now, thanks, Belle." At the same time I seemed to see a shadowy form which I somehow knew to be Belle, though she was unrecognisably muffled up in white drapery. The whole vision vanished literally in the winking of an eye, for, as I winked myself awake to look again at the puzzling apparition, it was gone. When my sister Hilda entered my room before breakfast, the first thing I said to her was, "How is Belle? Please ask her why she paid me a visit in her astral body last night." Belle's answer to this message was, "Indeed I didn't! Tell her *she* came in her astral body to *me*!"

Then Hilda heard details of the two dreams; and we all felt convinced that Belle had, by some sort of telepathy, been conscious that I was in pain and been able to make me aware of her sympathy.

Neither of us has ever been known to sleep-walk and as we have generally shared a room with a sister—often in fact roomed with one another—it is hardly possible we could have done so without its being known. The doors were not locked, but we both believe them to have remained shut all night. There was no one near enough to have heard if we did move about.

Isabelle and I have very frequently dreamt like dreams; that is to say, we have both dreamt of the same scene or the same people on the same night; but this is the only case of any sort of communication being recollected by us both on waking. The report already sent you of this incident was written by my sister Isabelle and signed by her as well as by Hilda and myself. . . .

ELIZABETH H. C. PAGAN (M.A. Edin.).

Miss Hilda Pagan wrote as follows:

24, NEWBATTLE TERRACE, EDINBURGH, *July 20th, 1905.*

One morning in March 1904 my sister Elizabeth told me when I went to her room before breakfast, that she had been ill in the night and had dreamt our sister

Isabelle had been in the room, standing near the door, and had asked, "Are you all right now?" On the invalid saying "Yes," Isabelle had disappeared, and indeed she had hardly been really recognisable according to outward appearance; Elizabeth had rather recognised her intuitively, and spoke to me of the dream as probably an "astral experience," an explanation I readily believed. I went to waken our sister in the next room and said, "Betty says you visited her in your astral body last night."

"Oh no, I didn't, she visited *me*," Isabelle answered. "I was wakened by her on my bed; she was ill, and I tried to sit up and make her comfortable, but I slept, and only woke once, when I asked, 'Are you all right now?' and she answered 'Yes.'"

G. HILDA PAGAN.

The case I have next to quote (L. 1106, *Journal*, Vol. VIII., p. 319) we owe to Mr. Andrew Lang, who was acquainted with the family concerned. In form it is a good reciprocal case, and, moreover, the experience at one end of the chain was collective. For these reasons it greatly interested Mr. Myers, who read it and commented on it at a meeting of the Society on November 4, 1898 (see *Journal*, *loc. cit.*). It has, however, certain evidential weaknesses to which I will refer after quoting it.

We have four statements from witnesses, namely :

(L. 1106.)

(1) *Narrative of Mary B., cook, attested by Isabella C., housemaid, and Jane D., parlourmaid. Taken down by J. L. B. from M. B.'s narration.*

On Friday night, December 11th, 1896, about 11 p.m., we were all sitting by the fire in the kitchen. We heard steps in the passage, coming from the hall and going along by the nursery door. Jane looked up and asked if I heard anything. I said, "Yes, I thought I heard Mrs. Blaikie walking along with her skirts rustling, from the front door along by the nursery." We had all heard it. I said I thought it was like a warning, and I said, "I hope Mrs. Blaikie isn't dead." Then we rose and went

to the door leading from the kitchen to the nursery passage, but saw nothing. Miss Frances heard our steps, and came out and asked what on earth was the matter. Miss Frances said she had heard it too, and thought it was one of us. Then we went upstairs to Miss Jeanie's room. She had heard it and said she hoped there were no burglars about. We went all over the house and looked everywhere but there was nothing to be seen. We then went to bed and have never heard it again. We all thought Mrs. Blaikie must be dead.

(Signed) MARY B.

ISABELLA C.

JANE D.

December 17th, 1897.

(2) On Friday night, December 11th, 1896, about 11 o'clock, I was writing, alone, in my bedroom—the first room at the top of the staircase, which is a low one. The house was quite quiet, and I fancied the servants had gone to bed, so that I was surprised to hear footsteps coming along the passage downstairs. I heard the steps come from the hall, past the foot of the staircase, and along the passage known as “the Nursery Lobby.” There they died away, and I heard no more. It was rather a heavy, quick, decided step, accompanied by the rustle of a silk dress, and was so exactly like my mother's that if I had not known her to be in Edinburgh, ill, at the time, I should not have had two doubts about it. I wondered which of the servants it could possibly be, thought I should ask in the morning, and went on writing. In a few minutes there was a knock at my door, and I opened it to find three scared and white-faced maids. They asked me if I had been downstairs, and looked more scared when I said no. They then asked if I had heard steps, and when I said “Yes, they sounded exactly like Mrs. Blaikie's,” they told me they had heard them as they sat in the kitchen, had gone to look in the hall and passage, and had seen no one. They then went to the “Nursery,” the room to which the passage where the steps were heard led, and asked my sister, whose bedroom it was, if she had left her room. She

said No, but had heard the steps. It was very evident they thought they had heard a ghost, and as my mother was rather seriously ill at the time, of course they concluded it was hers. We did not discuss this, however, and I suggested burglars, took my poker, and went with them in a procession all round the house. We looked in every room and closet, in every wardrobe, in the bath, and under every bed, and found nothing. The only other person in the house at the time, besides my sister, three maids, and myself, was my elder brother, who slept in a room upstairs not far from mine. I went to his room, and found him fast asleep. On being roused up he said he had not heard anything at all. In the letter I was writing at the time I mentioned that I had broken off to have a burglar hunt, and my correspondent kept it, so that we have in writing the date and hour.

(Signed) JEANIE LANG BLAIKIE.

HOLYDEAN, *December 17th*, 1897.

(3) About 11 o'clock on Friday night, December 11th, 1896, while undressing in my room I heard footsteps coming along the lobby towards the door. They were heavy and rather quick; exactly like my mother's, but not resembling those of any of the servants. I thought it must, however, be one of the maids, and paid no attention to them until the three servants came in a great state of panic to ask if it had been me. It did not strike me as being anything supernatural.

(Signed) F. M.

(4) On Thursday (December 10th, 1896), while visiting my niece, Miss L., 19, M. Terrace, Edinburgh, I was seized with an acute attack of laryngitis. The evening of the next day (Friday, December 11th), about 11 o'clock I had such a sensation of being suffocated that I felt as if I were dying, and would never see my home again. I was suddenly filled with an overpowering longing to be at home, and whether I fell asleep for a few moments and dreamed I do not know, but it seemed the next minute as if my desire was granted, and I felt I was

actually there. I was conscious of walking along the passage past the dressing-room door, and towards the room we call the nursery, but I had hardly time to realise my own joy and relief when I found myself still lying in bed, and the feeling of suffocation from which I had had such a happy respite for a few moments, again tormenting me. When I returned home a week later I was told by Jane D. of the curious occurrence at Holydean on the evening of Friday, the 11th.

(Signed) H. B.

The following are what seem to me evidential weaknesses in this case. Mrs. Blaikie's dream (as it presumably was) was not apparently a very striking one, and it does not seem to have been either recorded at the time or spoken of to any one till she heard of the experience of the percipients at the other end. One wonders if she would have remembered it, or thought anything of it, without this. Then again, as to the collective hearing of supposed footsteps—it is a rather common collective experience, *e.g.* in so-called haunted houses, but I remember no instance of footsteps being heard by one percipient only when others were present. This of course suggests real sounds misinterpreted, and indeed from the nature of the case the interpretation of a sound like footsteps unsupported by other evidence must generally be somewhat doubtful. In the present case there seems no doubt that five people in three different rooms heard sounds which more or less resembled Mrs. Blaikie's footsteps, and at least four of them also heard a sound like the rustling of her dress. But out of these five Mrs. Blaikie's two daughters attached no importance at the time to the sounds and did not attribute them to their mother; and though, on the other hand, the three servants, who were together and may have worked themselves up imaginatively by talking, feared the sounds portended her death—were, in fact, produced by her ghost—I do not think they can in themselves have been very striking. For these reasons the case does not seem to me to carry great weight as evidence of reciprocal

influence, but it is interesting nevertheless. A case described above with the death coincidences, L. 1141, see p. 242, should be compared with it.

I will conclude this analysis of our collection with two cases of reciprocal dreams. In both the dreamers were in separate houses, and in both the reciprocity seems to have been very complete; the dreamers dreamt together as it were, the dream drama the same for both and each in his own dream playing his own part.

A letter giving a short account of the case I will first quote (L. 1188, *Journal*, Vol. XV., p. 262), and also of a dream quoted above, p. 301 (L. 1189), appeared in *Light* on March 16, 1912. The Editor kindly forwarded a letter of enquiry addressed by us to his correspondent, with the result that we received more detailed reports of the incidents together with some corroborative statements. The names of those concerned have been communicated to us, but by their request pseudonyms are used here.

Mrs. "Barnard" writes on February 21, 1912, in a letter to a friend, which has been sent to us :

(L. 1188.)

Francis and George have had measles at school. I was anxious about them. . . . On Sunday, February 11, we were up nearly all night; Grace, aged three, had croup and Baby Betty had influenza. D. [Mrs. Barnard's husband] looked after Grace and I the baby. My thoughts were often with Francis; twice during the night I lay down on my bed and slept a little; each time I woke up telling Francis to be careful of Betty. I thought he could not sleep and wanted to put his head on my shoulder and could not because of Betty. To-day [Feb. 21¹] he writes, "I only had two nights when I could not sleep. You seemed quite close all night, only Betty would come between. You would not put her down. Do tell me what you did all Sunday night. You and Betty were with me all night. Were you thinking of me? You ought to have been asleep."

¹ The letter was received on February 21, 1912.

Upon the evidence of this letter alone, it might seem that the date referred to by Francis Barnard was Sunday, Feb. 18, not Feb. 11, but his statement, printed below, makes it clear that the earlier date is meant, when his illness was at its height.

In reply to a request for his corroboration of Mrs. Barnard's statement, Mr. Barnard writes in a communication received by us on April 2, 1912:

On Feb. 11 we were both up with sick children the greater part of the night. L. [Mrs. Barnard] had Baby Betty in her arms all night, sometimes in bed. We were both worried about the two boys at school with measles. L. was under the impression that Francis' head ached. She wanted him to put his head on her shoulder, but was afraid he would hurt the baby. Francis' next letter said that his mother was with him all night, but the baby was in the way. I am very sorry we burnt the letter for fear of infection of measles.

Francis Barnard (aged 13) writes as follows:

April 15, 1912.

In February, 1912, George and I had measles at school; on Sunday, Feb. 11th, I felt very bad and worse as night came on, and whether sleeping or waking I felt my mother was close beside me and Baby B. was in her arms and much in the way. Afterwards I found she had been up all night with baby, who was ill, and thought and dreamt of me all night. She thought I wanted to put my head on her shoulder and could not because of B. She woke Daddy up saying, "Mind B. you will hurt her." When I came home I was very surprised, for this was just what had happened. The second thing that surprised me was that mother knew that I was in the big dormitory the third bed from the door. This was just where I was. No one could have told her. I could not write, and no one else did. I was moved when I was ill in there and was not in my own room.

[Signed, FRANCIS BARNARD.]

In regard to the last part of Francis Barnard's statement Mrs. Barnard wrote on April 15, 1912:

No one told me he [Francis] was not ill in his own room. I all the same knew he was in the big Dormitory and his bed was the third on the door side. This I told him the day he returned and he was astonished. I knew his own room so well and I have only once been in the big Dormitory.

It is perhaps of some interest that Mrs. Barnard had another veridical dream—the one quoted above, p. 301—five days after this one. Perhaps the anxiety and agitation she had gone through had rendered her specially telepathically susceptible at the time.

The other case (L. 986, *Journal*, Vol. VII., p. 104) was sent to Dr. Hodgson through Dr. M. L. Holbrook, who was acquainted with both the percipients. The first account is from Dr. Adele A. Gleason.

(L. 986.)

THE GLEASON SANITARIUM, ELMIRA, N.Y. [*February*, 1892].

The night of Tuesday, January 26th, 1892, I dreamed between two and three o'clock that I stood in a lonesome place in dark woods. That great fear came on me; that a presence as of a man well-known to me came and shook a tree by me, and that its leaves began to turn to flame.

The dream was so vivid that I said to the man of whom I dreamed when I saw him four days later, "I had a very strange dream Tuesday night." He said, "Do not tell it to me; let me describe it, for I *know* I dreamed the same thing."

He then *without suggestion* from me duplicated the dream, which he knew, from time of waking from it, took place at the same hour of the same night.

ADELE A. GLEASON.

The account of the second dreamer, written at about the same time, is as follows :

From Mr. John R. Joslyn, Attorney-at-Law.

208, EAST WATER-STREET, ELMIRA, N.Y.

On Tuesday, January 26th, 1892, I dreamed that in a lonely wood where sometimes I hunted game, and was walking along after dark, I found a friend standing some ten feet in the bushes away from the road, apparently paralysed with fear of something invisible to me, and almost completely stupified by the sense of danger. I went to the side of my friend and shook the bush, when the falling leaves turned into flame.

On meeting this friend, a lady, some days afterward, she mentioned having had a vivid dream on Tuesday morning,¹ and I said, "Let me tell you mine first," and without suggestion I related a duplicate of her dream. I was awakened soon after and noted the time from a certain night train on a railroad near by, and so am certain that the dreams took place at same hour of same night.

J. R. JOSLYN.

In reply to Dr. Hodgson's enquiries, Dr. Gleason writes :

GLEASON SANITARIUM, ELMIRA, N.Y., *February 27th* [1892].

DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours returned, I am sorry to say that Mr. Joslyn has no notes of the dream, but he is sure of being waked from said dream by the scream of the R. R. whistle of the D. L. and W. train passing here at three o'clock a.m. I am in the country and was not waked by the train but by the vividness of the dream, and lighted a candle and noted time by watch.

I send page from my note-book written next a.m. The occurrence noted has "J. R. J." by the word "dream."

There is really no doubt of the duplicate.

(DR.) ADELE A. GLEASON.

[In answer to Dr. Hodgson's question, sent March 3rd, viz., Am I right in understanding that the record "night

¹ No doubt a slip for Tuesday night. January 26th, 1892, was a Tuesday.

of dream" and also the initials "J. R. J." were written the next morning? Dr. Gleason writes:]

Yes, they were written at the time before I saw J. R. J. The reason they are crowded in is because I had marked down the dates on the note-book previously, ready for experiment in day-time, so I had to crowd the night event unexpected in. . . .

ADELE GLEASON.

[The note referred to above reads, "Night of dream.—J. R. J."]

The phrase "experiment in day-time," in the extract from Dr. Gleason's letter, refers to experiments in thought-transference which, as Dr. Holbrook informed us, Dr. Gleason was carrying on with Mr. Joslyn during the time. It is much to be regretted that we have no record of these experiments or information as to their success or otherwise. It seems not unlikely that the fact that they were being carried on facilitated the dreaming in common.

It was realised by Gurney and those who worked with him in compiling his book that reciprocal cases are rare—so much so that he says, "the number of these reciprocal cases is . . . so small that the genuineness of the type might fairly enough be called in question." They are rare in our present collection also, but I nevertheless venture to think that those we have, not only add to the evidence for the genuineness of the type by adding to the number of cases, but that they help materially, taken in connection with other evidence in our collection, to throw light on the whole process of telepathic communication. Dream cases though they be, I am disposed to regard the last two cases quoted, and to which I have worked up as a kind of climax, as the fullest manifestations we have in the collection of telepathic communication. In other words, I think the kind of union of minds, the thinking and feeling together, here shown may be regarded as the type or norm of telepathic communication to which all other cases conform in varying degrees.

It is in collective cases that this can perhaps be most clearly seen. Take for instance the collective crystal vision described on p. 48, where there is movement in the picture. The percipients here have ideas and images in common within the limits of the crystal vision, though the personal element with its emotions and sensations, as exhibited in the last two reciprocal cases, is absent. It is generally easiest, I think, to explain the cases of collective hallucinations and corresponding dreams described in the present chapter as reciprocal—as instances of the two minds working together. And this may still be so when the process is aided by verbal or other suggestion, or when some third mind, living or dead, shares in the process, influencing one or both percipients.¹

If this partial merging of the two minds is the true type of telepathic communication, the degree to which it takes place in different instances evidently varies enormously, or at least its manifestation does. Thus, unlike the dreams last quoted, the two dreams in L. 1162 (p. 357, above) were very different from each other, meeting apparently only in the one point of drowning and rescue of the wife. I have already pointed out that in the semi-reciprocal cases of Mrs. Green and Captain Ward (L. 1150, p. 395, above), and of Miss Steele and Mr. Burgess (L. 1187, p. 398, above), the evidence carries us little beyond simultaneous hallucinatory impressions of each other experienced by the two percipients with (at least on one side) hallucination-producing force; and that in apparitions at the time of death the impression received by the percipient is usually nothing more than a vivid idea of the presence of the dying person. There are two stages in the process of manifestation of telepathic communication at which failure, that is incompleteness, may occur. There may be incomplete contact between the two minds concerned; and when that contact is subliminal, as I imagine is generally the case, there may be

¹ This intervention of a third mind must of course occur in *veridical* collective cases, *e.g.* the dreams of the brother's fatal accident (L. 1138, p. 271 above). And it may have happened in *e.g.* G. 275 (p. 378), or L. 1169 (p. 379) in the present chapter, though we have no evidence of it.

incomplete emergence in either mind from the subliminal to the supraliminal consciousness. The contact could not be really complete—it could not extend to the whole content of either mind—without loss of individual personality, but short of this it may presumably vary in completeness through all possible degrees. Emergence into the conscious again varies probably in degree. It certainly varies in method, as it may occur through remembered dreams, through waking hallucinations, through motor automatism such as automatic writing, or through conscious but non-externalised waking impressions of various degrees of definiteness, such as those described in Chapter II. above. It probably often happens that there is telepathic communication which does not emerge into the normal consciousness at all. We cannot therefore tell where failure occurs, nor why or how any particular case differs from the normal type. But this is, of course, equally true whether we think of the process as transmission of thought or as merging together of minds—what we might perhaps call transfusion of thought.

In regarding the merging or transfusion as the normal type of telepathic process no new theory is involved—nor any idea not already expressed by other students of the subject. It is only looking at the subject from a somewhat different angle from that suggested by the experiments with which our investigations almost inevitably began. In those experiments there is obviously an agent and a percipient—the agent consciously trying to transmit an idea to the percipient who is trying to receive it. The physical analogy suggested by this is some force in the agent causing something to be transferred through space to the percipient—we compare the process to radiant energy like light or heat or sound. Of course we soon realise that it is not radiant energy—that the analogy must not be pressed so far; but the idea of transmission fits many spontaneous cases (*e.g.* simple death coincidences) as well as experimental ones, and we get into the habit of thinking in terms of this analogy.

Analogy is a dangerous instrument in reasoning, for the very reason that it is difficult to keep its limitations in

mind when using it. But in speaking of psychical matters its use is almost a necessity. We can hardly think of concrete things except in terms of the world of space matter and motion in which we live, and are driven to express ourselves in metaphor and by analogy. Something may be gained, however, by using different analogies and so looking at things from different points of view; and that is what I am trying to do in speaking of minds being in more or less complete contact with one another. Contact or transfusion is a physical idea just as much as transference or transmission, and probably represents what actually occurs almost, if not quite, as imperfectly. But it has the merit of eliminating the idea of distance and false analogies depending on that. And the habit of thinking of what occurs from the point of view the contact analogy suggests, may, I think, be more fruitful—lead us further towards the truth—than that produced by the transmission-through-space analogy. For one thing it seems to fit more cases. While applicable to all the cases which the transmission-through-space analogy fits, it also fits cases where the idea of direct transfer presents difficulties. For instance, take the case (L. 1127, p. 147, above) where Miss F. dreams veridically her brother's place in an examination—there was no known connection between the examiner and the dreamer, or reason why an idea should be transferred from one to the other. But the sister's mind may well have been in contact with the brother's and the examiner's with that of the examinee whom he had just examined and placed. Thus through the brother, in whose own mind the idea never emerged into consciousness, the examiner and the sister might be in touch. It fits, too, cases of unconscious leakage where the idea is so trivial that one does not see why it should reach the percipient at all, unless some common content of the two minds, such as might be produced by their staying in the same house, puts them in contact (see, for example, L. 1228, p. 315). It fits cases of seeming telepathic clairvoyance, such as Mrs. D.'s mental vision of Mrs. H. (L. 1152, p. 58), where any activity was on the side of the percipient. It at least makes more compre-

hensible the apprehension by the percipient of public events of general interest, but not special private interest (see, for example, M. Aut. 104, p. 73), and other cases where we cannot trace a particular agent. The mental contact analogy seems, in fact, more elastic than the transference analogy, and lends itself better to any case where the relation of agent and percipient is not simple and obvious. Moreover, I may add, though it is outside our present province, that if we may assume telepathic communication with the dead, the contact analogy seems to fit the case of communications through mediums. For the communicator in mental contact with his friend the sitter may through him get into contact with the mind of the medium—the medium being a person through whom the communication can be brought out into consciousness. Some such hypothesis to account for the relation of medium, sitter and communicator seems to be required. It is probably only some sitters who are capable of acting as a telepathic link in this way, which may account for the more satisfactory communications received by some sitters than others.

What I have been saying, and indeed this whole paper, shows what need there is of further evidence to throw light on the subject of telepathy. And, as we all know, a further accumulation of well-evidenced cases is required to convince the scientific world of its existence. So I will conclude with an appeal to Members and Associates of the Society to send us all well-evidenced cases, recorded soon after their occurrence, which they can hear of. If all our Members took as much pains as some of them do to look out for, and report fully, interesting cases, our collection of well-evidenced and convincing telepathic incidents would, I feel certain, increase more rapidly than it does, and our knowledge of telepathy would grow with it. I believe too, that if more people would only try, we should find that the number who are capable of obtaining telepathic impressions through, for example, crystal gazing is greater than we know; and likewise that experiment would reveal more people capable of producing impressions on others telepathically.

LIST OF CASES QUOTED OR DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE PAPER.

Dreams are marked with a D.

Cases which are described but not quoted are enclosed in square brackets.

CHAPTER I.

EXPERIMENTAL AND SEMI-EXPERIMENTAL CASES.

No. of Case.	Volume and page in <i>Journal</i> .	Interval between experience and record.	Remarks.	Page
--------------	---	--	----------	------

§ 1. *Experimental Cases.*

A list of 10 sets of unpublished experiments in thought-transference is given with their places in the *Journal* on pp. 31-32.

There are also two experimental crystal visions as follows, viz. :

M. Cl. 97	IX. 78	A fortnight	Crystal vision - - -	33
	VIII. 71	9 days	„ „ - - -	35

§ 2. *Semi-experimental Cases. Percipient experimenting.*

Crystal Visions.

M. Cl. 93	VII. 124	3 weeks	- - - - -	40
L. 1215	XVIII. 191	1 year	- - - - -	41
L. 1216	XVIII. 192	1 day	- - - - -	43
L. 1134	XI. 157	6 weeks	Spontaneous - - -	45
L. 1126	X. 134	At the time	Collective - - -	48

Visions not in a Crystal.

L. 1208	XVII. 235	Next day	Appearance in room - -	50
G. 267	X. 170	About a month	At a seance - - -	54
[M. Cl. 22	V. 73	2 yrs. 8 mon.	Do. do. - - -	57]
L. 1152	XII. 307	Same day	Distant scene perceived -	58

Non-externalised Impressions.

L. 1164	XIII. 130	Various	A series of impressions -	63
M. Cl. 96	VIII. 227	2 days	Place of lost object - -	71

Table-tilting, etc.

M. Aut. 104	XIII. 35	At the time	Table tilting - - -	73
[M. Aut. 105	XIII. 211	3 months	Ouija board - - -	76]

§ 3. *Semi-experimental Cases. Agent experimenting.*

[VIII. 90, 99	Next day	Hypnotisation at a distance	78]
L. 996	VII. 193	1 year	Willing percipient to come	78
Do.	Do.	8 months	Do. do.	79
[VII. 299, 311	At the time	Mrs. S.'s diary of telepathic impressions - - -	81]
L. 851	IV. 323	1 yr. 8 mon.	Apparition of agent - -	83
L. 1056	VII. 250	? 4 years	Apparition of agent - -	85

CHAPTER II.

SPONTANEOUS CASES IN WHICH THE PERCIPIENT'S IMPRESSION IS NOT
EXTERNALISED.

No. of Case.	Volume and page in <i>Journal</i> .	Interval between experience and record.	Remarks.	Page
§ 1. <i>Pain transferred.</i>				
L. 1157	XIII. 79	6 days - -	In same room - - -	91
L. 1172	XIII. 284	Next day -	Do. do. - - -	92
L. 1102	VIII. 298	10 months -	- - - - -	94
§ 2. <i>Phrases transferred.</i>				
L. 1163	XIII. 120	Nearly 2 years	- - - - -	95
L. 857	IV. 341	1 week -	- - - - -	96
L. 858	IV. 342	Recently -	- - - - -	97
L. 859	IV. 342	About 3 years	- - - - -	97
L. 898	V. 191	Next day	Teacher to pupil - -	98
L. 1196	XVI. 76	3 weeks	Talking in sleep - -	99
[L. 1192	XV. 339		Percipient recovering from concussion - - -	100]
§ 3. <i>Emotion transferred.</i>				
L. 1186	XV. 188	1 month	Child percipient - -	101
[L. 899	V. 192	2 years -	- - - - -	103]
[XIX. 173	About 4 yrs.	One of a number of experi- ences of percipient -	103]
§ 4. <i>Idea from distant agent.</i>				
L. 831	IV. 179	2½ months -	Proposal - - - -	104
L. 1213	XVIII. 56	About 6 days	Sending for percipient -	107
§ 5. <i>Motor Impulse.</i>				
L. 893	V. 172	4 yrs. 9 mon.	Impulse to fetch a shawl -	109
L. 1131	XI. 80	5 years	Impulse to play a par- ticular piece of music -	110
[L. 886	V. 137	A few months	Do. do. - - -	115]
§ 6. <i>Vague impressions of danger.</i>				
[L. 990	VII. 120	A few months	- - - - -	116]
L. 1142	XI. 323	A few months	Animal agent ? - - -	116
P. 285	XVI. 29	Next day, etc.	Landslip in quarry - -	119
§ 7. <i>Vague but insistent thought of agent.</i>				
L. 972	VI. 212	About a year	Perhaps reciprocal - -	124
L. 1199	XVI. 203	9 days	Agent dying - - -	126
[XIX. 175	A few months	Do. - - - - -	128]
§ 8. <i>Thought of agent and his condition.</i>				
L. 1125	X. 79	Same evening	Agent dying - - -	129
P. 262	IX. 79	2 days	Do. - - - - -	131
L. 1217	XVIII. 193	4 months	Agent dying or dead. Child percipient - - -	133
L. 1176	XIV. 99	5½ weeks	Illness - - - - -	135
L. 1103	VIII. 308	Next day	Alarm of fire - - -	137
L. 1144	XII. 21	4 years	Animal agent - - -	139
L. 1158	XIII. 80	8 days	D Animal agent - - -	141

No. of Case.	Volume and page in Journal.	Interval between experience and record.	Remarks.	Page
§ 9. <i>True impression. Doubtful agent.</i>				
G. 237	VI. 105	1 yr. 9 mon.	D Brother dead - - -	142
P. 269	X. 28	1 yr. 10 mon.	D Brother's appointment -	144
L. 1127	X. 140	11 months	D Brother's place in examination - - -	147
§ 10. <i>Mental vision of complicated event.</i>				
L. 1160	XIII. 116	3 weeks	Carriage accident - -	149

CHAPTER III.

WAKING HALLUCINATIONS AND DREAMS OF THE SAME CHARACTER.

§ 1. *Death Coincidences.*(a) *Visual realistic—like a real person in percipient's surroundings.*

L. 1226	XIX. 76	Fortnight	Apparition speaks - - -	152
L. 1146	XII. 59	11 weeks	Do. do. - - -	160
L. 980	VII. 8	Fortnight	Child percipient - - -	166
L. 1223	XIX. 39	9½ months	Appearance and impression to different percipients apart - - -	167
[L. 1130	XI. 58	14 months	Do. do. - - -	177]
L. 834	IV. 213	4 years	Seen by hallucinatory light	177
[L. 1121	IX. 306	About 3 years	Perhaps influenced by place - - -	179]
L. 1224	XIX. 47	1 month	Do. do. - - -	180
L. 1087	VIII. 41	1½ years	Perhaps influenced by place. A second figure seen but not recognised. -	183
[L. 947	VI. 9	Next day	- - - - -	189]
L. 1204	XVII. 204	3 weeks	Percipient ill - - -	190
[L. 1159	XIII. 103	4 months	Collective - - -	194]
L. 1179	XIV. 295	4 months	D - - - - -	195
L. 1147	XII. 99	3 weeks	D - - - - -	196
L. 1220	XIX. 3	3 months	D Request to communicate -	199

(b) *Appearance not realistic.*

L. 977	VI. 368	13 months	Promise to communicate -	203
L. 974	VI. 280	1 year	Do. do. - - -	205
L. 979	VII. 7	4½ months	Threefold figure - - -	208
L. 991	VII. 121	2 months	Shadowy, recognised - -	210
[L. 839	IV. 268	Nearly 4 yrs.	Shadowy, unrecognised -	212]

(c) *Visual with veridical or symbolic adjuncts.*

L. 978	VI. 368	3½ years	D Vision - - - -	213
L. 973	VI. 249	13 months	D - - - - -	216
[L. 1108	VIII. 328	A week	D - - - - -	218]
[L. 1124	X. 33	2 yrs. 2 mon.	D - - - - -	219]
L. 1139	XI. 278	1 week	D Animal agent - - -	219
[L. 1166	XIII. 140	22 days	D Symbolic - - - -	231]
[L. 1175	XIV. 75	5 weeks	D Do - - - - -	231]

(d) *Appearance of relative of dying person.*

[L. 1153	XII. 317	3 days	Twofold appearance - -	231]
L. 1211	XVIII. 35	Same day	D - - - - -	232
[L. 1115	IX. 127	Within a week	D - - - - -	235]

No. of Case.	Volume and page in Journal.	Interval between experience and record.	Remarks.	Page
(e) <i>Symbolic experiences.</i>				
[L. 966	VI. 181	About 4 years	- - - - -	235]
[L. 1093	VIII. 130	A few days	- - - - -	235]
[L. 1094	VIII. 134	At once	D - - - - -	235]

(f) *Auditory death coincidences.*

L. 929	V. 204	4½ years	Voice announcing death	236
L. 1180	XIV. 327	10 days	D Death of friend's brother	237
M. Cl. 88	VI. 293	1 month	D Carnot's murder	241
L. 1141	XI. 320	10 months	Footsteps and knocks	242
L. 1151	XII. 196	11 days	Knocks - - - - -	242

§ 2. *Coincidence with illness of or accident to agent.**Agent ill.*

L. 1207	XVIII. 230	3½ years	Vision. Repeated	243
L. 1209	XVIII. 19	3 months	Apparition. Misrecognition at first	249
L. 1088	VIII. 78	2 years	Apparition on waking	255
L. 1129	X. 263	6 weeks	D Of agent with swollen face	257
[L. 964	VI. 168	2½ years	D - - - - -	260]
L. 1195	XVI. 41	4 days	D Telegram seen, etc.,	260
L. 937	V. 251	4 months	D Symbolic funeral	262
G. 234	VI. 83	A few days	D Do.	263
[L. 994	VII. 176	16 days	D Do.	263]
[L. 967	VI. 183	11 months	Unrecognised call. Some local connection	264]
[L. 987	VII. 106	1 week	D Unrecognised. Rap and announcement of a death	264]
L. 820	III. 356	2½ years	Two percipients, apart. Apparitions	265
L. 1210	XVIII. 25	4½ months	D Two percipients, apart. Dreams	268

Accident to agent.

L. 1138	XI. 269	5 months	D Two percipients, together. Simultaneous dreams	271
L. 1221	XIX. 7	? 6 weeks	- Agent's voice heard	276
L. 1193	XV. 342	3 days	Vision	278
[L. 989	VII. 108	7 months	- - - - -	279]
L. 992	VII. 125	2 days	D Dream of accident, but to wrong sister	280
L. 1165	XIII. 136	15 months	D Two dreams	282
[L. 1113	IX. 104	7 days	D - - - - -	285]
[L. 1118	IX. 151	6 weeks	D - - - - -	286]
[L. 1178	XIV. 155	1 year	D - - - - -	286]

§ 3. *Coincidence with idea or wish connected by the agent with the percipient.*

L. 1227	XIX. 83	3 months	Apparition summoning percipient	287
L. 1143	XII. 14	4 days	Call	292
L. 1177	XIV. 143	Same day	Do.	293
[L. 993	VII. 162	4 years	Bell. ? Collective	295]
L. 1222	XIX. 30	9 months	Voice. Arrival case	295
L. 1225	XIX. 56	2 days	D Repeated. Do.	296
L. 1135	XI. 177	2 days	D Letter case	298
L. 1189	XV. 263	5 days	D Do.	301

No. of Case.	Volume and page in <i>Journal</i> .	Interval between experience and record.	Remarks.	Page
§ 3. <i>Coincidence with idea or wish connected by the agent with the percipient.</i> —contd.				
L. 1133	XI. 138	3 days D	Letter case - - -	302
L. 954	VI. 103	1 yr. 5 mon. D	Do. - - -	305
L. 936	V. 246	About 2½ yrs. D	Newspaper case - - -	307
[G. 268	X. 232	10 days D	Do. - - -	308]
[L. 1174	XIV. 72	1 month D	Do. - - -	308]
L. 1137	XI. 227	About 3 mon. D	Letter case - - -	309
L. 895	V. 173	Next day D	Do. - - -	310
L. 1218	XVIII. 225	3 months D	Do. - - -	312

§ 4. *Coincidence with idea of agent not connected by him with percipient.*

Unconscious telepathic leakage.

L. 1219	XVIII. 227	Nearly 3 mon. D	No emotion of agent -	313
L. 836	IV. 221	A fortnight D	Do. - - -	314
L. 1228	XIX. 138	Same day D	Do. - - -	315
L. 1191	XV. 337	12 days D	Do. - - -	317
[L. 1182	XIV. 383	2 months D	Do. - - -	318]
L. 1184	XV. 87	2 months D	Do. - - -	319
L. 1185	XV. 107	17 months D	Do. - - -	320
[L. 1096	VIII. 141	9 months D	Do. - - -	321]
[L. 1098	VIII. 145	9 weeks D	Do. - - -	321]
L. 1168	XIII. 153	Next day ? D	Repeated. Agent agitated	322
L. 1173	XIII. 328	Next day D	Agent trying for vision -	323
L. 1183	XV. 17	Next day D	Agent agitated - - -	325
[L. 1197	XVI. 118	14 months	Vision. Agent agitated -	329]
[P. 286	XVI. 51	About 5 mon. D	Premonition or telepathy -	330]

§ 5. *Ambiguous Cases.*

Coinciding event insufficiently marked, or time coincidence uncertain.

L. 1109	VIII. 329	5 months	Realistic. Three senses affected - - -	333
L. 1200	XVI. 205	4 days	Realistic. Two senses -	335
L. 896	V. 174	5½ weeks	Realistic. Do. -	336
[L. 1073	IV. 253	2 days	Realistic. Do. -	337]
L. 950	VI. 29	About 1 year	Apparition unrealistic -	338
[L. 962	VI. 165	4 months	Apparition - - -	339]
[L. 1198	XVI. 149	3 days	Vision - - -	339]
L. 1156	XIII. 27	2 days	Apparition. Perhaps dog co-percipient - -	340
L. 844	IV. 289	Next day	Dog agent ? Auditory -	342
[G. 277	XII. 54	2 yrs. and 6 weeks	Bang on door. Collective -	343]
[L. 1190	XV. 289	15 months	? Collective apparition -	343]

Agent doubtful.

L. 1212	XVIII. 51	11 months D	Concerning son's death -	344
L. 1206	XVII. 212	4 days	Place of picture perceived on waking - - -	349
[L. 1119	IX. 227	1 yr. 8 mon. D	Place of lost box - - -	351]
M. Cl. 87	VI. 264	1 month	Explosion heard on waking	352
[L. 1201	XVI. 306	At time	Two impressions of sinking ships - - -	352]
[L. 1214	XVIII. 92	Within day or two D	Two dreams of air raids - - -	353]

CHAPTER IV.

COLLECTIVE AND RECIPROCAL CASES WITH NO EVIDENCE OF AGENCY
EXTERNAL TO THE PERCIPIENTS.

No. of Case.	Volume and page in <i>Journal</i> .	Interval between experience and record.	Remarks.	Page
§ 1. <i>Similar and Simultaneous Dreams.</i>				
L. 835	IV. 220	1 month	D - - - - -	355
L. 965	VI. 169	About 2 yrs.	D - - - - -	356
L. 1162	XIII. 119	2 years	D - - - - -	357
L. 1161	XIII. 118	2 days	D - - - - -	358
L. 1181	XIV. 381	Same day	Child dreams. Mother simultaneously sees apparition - - - -	359
§ 2. <i>Collective Visual Hallucinations. Unrecognised.</i>				
[G. 200	V. 221	About 3 yrs.	Out of doors at dusk - - - -	362]
[L. 1148	XII. 121	Next day	Out of doors in mist - - - -	362]
G. 241	VI. 145	1½ years	At night - - - -	363
L. 842	IV. 286	8 weeks	" - - - -	364
G. 201	V. 223	1½ years	Poor light - - - -	367
G. 239	VI. 135	1 year	At night - - - -	371
G. 230	VI. 22	9 months	Fading light - - - -	372
L. 827	IV. 71	4 years	Man seen fishing - - - -	376
§ 3. <i>Collective Visual Hallucinations. Recognised.</i>				
G. 275	XI. 185	6 months	Mother seen at bedside of dying child - - - -	378
L. 1169	XIII. 210	About 2 years	Indoors, good light - - - -	379
G. 286	XV. 249	6 days	Apparition of a cat - - - -	381
L. 959	VI. 131	Next day	Out of doors, good light - - - -	387
L. 828	IV. 72	2 months	Apparition speaks - - - -	390
§ 4. <i>Collective Auditory Cases.</i>				
[L. 1203	XVII. 118	? 2 years	Music - - - -	393]
[L. 960	VI. 139	Within month	Recognised voice - - - -	393]
G. 247	VII. 9	9 months	Unrecognised voice - - - -	393]
§ 5. <i>Semi-Reciprocal and Reciprocal Cases.</i>				
L. 1150	XII. 193	5 weeks	One visual, one auditory - - - -	395
L. 1187	XV. 259	8 days	Do. do. - - - -	398
L. 1122	IX. 331	4 days	Dreams in different rooms - - - -	404
L. 1149	XII. 173	14 months	Dream & Apparition - - - -	406
L. 1106	VIII. 319	1 year	Dream & footsteps heard collectively - - - -	411
L. 1188	XV. 262	10 days	Dreams in different houses - - - -	415
L. 986	VII. 104	1 month	Do. do. - - - -	417